

DEC 2 1902

The American Family

THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL PSYCHOLOGY
THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL PSYCHOLOGY
THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL PSYCHOLOGY

Vol. I. No. 1

	Page
KRISTIANSEN, E. A. The Psychology of the Family	1
FURBER, C. The Psychology of the Family	11
GUNDEL, J. The Psychology of the Family	15
KRISTIANSEN, E. A. The Psychology of the Family	25
KRISTIANSEN, E. A. The Psychology of the Family	35
LANE, J. The Psychology of the Family	45
LANE, J. The Psychology of the Family	45
Miscellaneous	45
Back Matter	50

THE AMERICAN FAMILY
PUBLISHED BY THE AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION
1902

THE AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION
1902

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

Edited by

THE FACULTY OF CONCORDIA SEMINARY,
ST. LOUIS, MO.

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE:

PROF. W. ARNDT
PROF. THEO. LANTIER
PROF. P. FURBRINGER
PROF. D. KANTZMANN

BOOK REVIEWERS:

Lawson, Marvin: *Die neuen Evangelien*
Barbara, John: *The Son of God*
Jensen, Walter: *The Ministry*
Allen, George: *Das apostolische Gottesbild in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart*
Altman, Paul: *Das Neue Christ*
Dietrich, Theodor: *Christenheit vs. Christentum*
Kuhn, Hans: *Die Kirche Christi*
Kuhn, Hans: *Die Kirche Christi*
Kuhn, Hans: *Die Kirche Christi*
Kuhn, Hans: *Die Kirche Christi*
Kuhn, Hans: *Die Kirche Christi*
Kuhn, Hans: *Die Kirche Christi*
Kuhn, Hans: *Die Kirche Christi*
Kuhn, Hans: *Die Kirche Christi*
Kuhn, Hans: *Die Kirche Christi*
Kuhn, Hans: *Die Kirche Christi*

Original communications to the Editorial Committee in care
of the Managing Editor.

Prof. P. F. Furbringer, 3710 Main Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

All business communications to be addressed to the Editor.

Copyright, 1914, by Concordia Publishing House, 3710 Main Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

Published monthly, except two issues combined in January and July.

Entered as Second-Class Matter, June 26, 1901, at St. Louis, Mo., as Second-Class Matter, under No. 100,000, Postoffice at St. Louis, Mo., authorized by Postoffice Department, June 26, 1901.

Concordia Theological Monthly

VOL. IV

JANUARY, 1933

No. 1

Foreword.

Can the Lutheran Bodies of America Get Together?

The *Kirchliche Zeitschrift* of August, 1932, in reviewing the resolutions of the Missouri Synod in its meeting at Milwaukee in June, remarks: "*Die noch vor F. Piepers Tod veroeffentlichten Thesen ueber Missouris Lehrstellung wurden offiziell angenommen, und damit ist die Arbeit des Intersynodalen Komitees begraben.*" (Page 500.)

A layman writes to the *Lutheran* of October 6, 1932: "Have enjoyed the series of four articles on 'Lutheran Union' as presented from four different viewpoints. However, your editorial remarks concerning the above were quite disappointing to me in so far as you do not seem to like 'free conferences.' How will we Lutherans ever get together if we refuse to confer with one another? Surely a free conference is a good beginning. Differences will crop out of course, but must be honestly faced by all. We Lutherans cannot unite by ignoring real differences. A mere church-government union will not suffice. It might be best if all parties that differ would confer and draw up a statement of faith based on the Bible in harmony with the accepted Confessions, and the same could eventually be used as a working basis for future 'Lutheran unity' and then 'Lutheran union.'"

All of which causes us to ask the question at the head of this article: "Can the Lutheran Bodies of America Get Together?"

Let it be stated at once that the prospects seem to be rather favorable, if one may be guided by recent public and semipublic utterances in resolutions of organizations and in statements made by representative men upon occasions which were regarded as confessional demonstrations.

There must, of course, be a common and solid confessional basis. The Word of God, inerrant and infallible in its entirety and in all its parts, must be regarded as the *norma normans*, the one and only

source of doctrine and norm of life. The writings of the Lutheran Church as contained in the Book of Concord and as now accepted or recognized by all the Lutheran bodies of America must be regarded as the *norma normata* in all their doctrinal statements and expositions. Without this common basis there can be no thought of common doctrinal thinking and therefore not of doctrinal unity. And let it be understood at once that *all* the doctrines of the Bible must be considered as essential in this platform, since the difference between fundamental and non-fundamental doctrines is one merely of degree. It has been correctly stated by Stump (*The Christian Faith*, 18): "A distinction has sometimes been drawn between fundamental and non-fundamental articles of faith. But when the effort is made to point out which doctrines are fundamental and which are not, a difficulty arises. The fact is that, while some doctrines are more necessary to salvation than others, no doctrines taught in God's Word dare to be regarded as of no real consequence; and furthermore many doctrines which seem at first glance to be non-fundamental are found, when carried to their logical conclusions, to bear largely on doctrines which are unmistakably fundamental." It has well been said that all the doctrines of the Bible together form a chain and that, if one link of the chain is broken, the entire chain is severed. — But while this confessional basis *must* be maintained and insisted upon, we are just as emphatic in subscribing the words of the Augustana: "And to the true unity of the Church it is enough to agree concerning the doctrine of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments. Nor is it necessary that human traditions, that is, rites or ceremonies *instituted by men*, should be everywhere alike." (Art. VII, "Of the Church." Cp. Art. XV, "Of Ecclesiastical Usages.")

The question now arises, if we may be permitted to borrow a term from the world of sports: *How do the various Lutheran bodies of America line up*, chiefly with regard to those Scriptural doctrines which have been in controversy at one time or other? Let us follow the divisions of doctrinal theology as commonly accepted in order to see just where the difficulties lie and whether any progress has been made in removing misunderstandings and false conceptions.

Bibliology. — Here the various confessions and public declarations *in themselves* seem to be adequate. For example, the General Synod, numerically the largest of the bodies now constituting the United Lutheran Church of America, stated in its Richmond Resolutions: "Resolved, That we herewith declare our adherence to the statement 'The Bible is the Word of God' and reject the error implied in the statement 'The Bible contains the Word of God.'" (Neve, *A Brief History of the Lutheran Church in America*, 453.) This was in 1909. Four years later, at Atchison, Kans., it was reported that the constitution of the body had been changed and accepted by the

constituent synods, in agreement with the Richmond Resolutions, so that Article II, on the Doctrinal Basis, read: "With the Evangelical Lutheran Church of the Fathers, the General Synod receives and holds the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the Word of God and the only infallible rule of faith and practise; and it receives and holds the Unaltered Augsburg Confession as a correct exhibition of the faith and doctrine of our Church as founded upon that Word." (Neve, *Op. cit.*, 184.) The former Ohio Synod very emphatically stated its position with regard to the doctrine of inspiration in the resolutions of 1926: "The Synod accepts all the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments as the inspired and inerrant Word of God and the only source, norm, and guide of faith and life," even opposing the change as suggested by the delegate of the former Iowa Synod, which read: "The Synod accepts all the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments as the inspired Word of God and the inerrant and only source, norm, and guide of faith and life." (*Report*, 246 ff.) This was in agreement with the Minneapolis Theses of 1925, as drawn up by representatives of the Iowa, Ohio, and Buffalo synods and the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America, which stated: "The synods signatory to these Articles of Agreement accept without exception all the canonical books of the Old and the New Testament, as a whole and in all their parts, as the divinely inspired, revealed, and inerrant Word of God and submit to this as the only infallible authority in all matters of faith and life." (*Theol. Monthly*, VII, 112.) The confession of inerrancy was placed in the appendix of the Constitution of the American Lutheran Church, while the constitution proper has the reading: "The Synod accepts all the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments as the inspired Word of God and the inerrant and only source, norm, and guide of faith and life." But it may be assumed, so far as the constituent bodies forming the American Lutheran Church are concerned, that they stand unequivocally for the inerrancy of Scripture. The *Kirchenblatt* of September 10, 1932, states: "*Damit kommen wir nun zu dem eigentlichen Geheimnis der Bibel, naemlich zu dem Geheimnis ihres Ursprungs, wir meinen zu ihrer Inspiration. . . . Dabei ist es auch wahr, dass Gott durch diese Maenner geredet hat und dass sie, solange sie inspiriert waren, nur Gottes Wort redeten, frei von allem Irrtum und aller Truebung.*" And the *Pastor's Monthly* of September, 1932, says, in an article on "The Divine Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures": "If there is no verbal inspiration, then we can never be sure that we have God's revelation. . . . Neither the matter nor the form of God's revelation is of human origin. God made use of human beings and of human language to give us a divine revelation, a revelation which as to form as well as substance is above human frailty. In a most eminent sense God is the Author of the

Holy Scriptures." With such statements coming from every part of the Lutheran Church, from practically every body, an agreement as to the platform should not be impossible.

However, it must be understood that no doubts, concessions, or ambiguous statements may be permitted, as though, for example, the inerrancy of Holy Scripture were a mere theological deduction, not a clear doctrine of the Bible itself, or that the absolute inspiration and the verbal inerrancy of the Bible in all its parts were a doctrine peculiar to the later dogmaticians, and that one cannot hold every single statement of the Bible to be literally true, or that Scripture merely *contains* the revelation of God to men, or that "the words of the Bible are inspired words because they are the words of inspired men," or that "the inspiration was confined to matters of religion and that on scientific matters the holy writers neither knew nor professed to know more than other men of their day." Such statements are either outright erroneous or misleading or inadequate, for which reason a God-pleasing unity would demand that they be eliminated from the spoken and the written expressions within the Lutheran Church.¹⁾

Theology.—In this division of Christian doctrine the various Lutheran bodies show a most commendable unity, in keeping with the Ecumenical Creeds, both the Trinity and the Triunity being respected as well as the full deity of every Person of the Godhead. However, it certainly disturbs the analogy of faith as well as the balance of Scriptures if one "does not find the doctrine of the Trinity revealed in the Old Testament," since the second part of the Book of Isaiah repeatedly distinguishes three Persons of the Godhead and ascribes personality and activity to every one of them. In this connection it should also be noted that the practise of dealing with dissenters in the fundamental doctrines of this section of Bible truth should be more consistent, since even according to the *Symbolum Quicunque* a person not in agreement with the doctrine of the Trinity cannot be saved.

Anthropology and Cosmology.—Here the unanimous confession of the Lutheran Church demands the belief in a creation *ex nihilo*, which certainly excludes both an atheistic and a theistic evolution. Writers in practically every part of the Lutheran Church of America have denounced the vagaries of materialism and of the theory of evolution. (Cp. books by Graebner, Gruber, Keyser, Schoeler, etc.) But it would seem that an unequivocal position concerning this doctrine would also eliminate statements declaring that "the writer of Genesis lacked such a knowledge of the vastness of the universe and

1) Our position is stated in CONCORDIA THEOL. MONTHLY, I, 21 ff. 107 ff.; II, 190. 655 ff. 754 ff.; III, 838 ff.; *Lehre und Wehre*, 1902, 129 ff.

of the nature of chemical and geological processes as the modern man possesses." (We have in mind, of course, the statements contained in the inspired account.) If the omniscient and eternal God inspired the Book of Genesis, He was possessed of a vastly greater amount of information than that exhibited by all the proponents of the theory of evolution taken together.²⁾

Christology.—With regard to the doctrine of the person of Christ there seems to exist complete unanimity, both in confession (virgin birth, deity) and in practise. Apparently none of the Lutheran bodies of America are now tolerating in their midst any open denial of these truths.

Soteriology.—With reference to the doctrine of the office of Christ the confessional basis as well as the actual confession of every Lutheran church-body in America seems to be in full harmony with Scriptures and the Lutheran Confessions. The strange aberration of the teaching of a *kenosis* in the humiliation of Christ has found no acceptance in the Lutheran Church in America, although it may have influenced some individuals for a time. However, their teaching was not tolerated, at least not officially. The same is true with regard to the active obedience of the Savior, which is denied in some parts of the Church. With the Holy Scriptures and the Lutheran Confessions both the active and the passive obedience of Christ in His work of atonement are generally taught among Lutherans. Concerning Christ's descent into hell there seems to be some haziness, since the *κηρύσσειν* of 1 Pet. 3, 19 is taken to be an announcement that the "dealings of God with Old Testament believers and unbelievers would be completely vindicated." Others seem to hold the view expressed by some of the older Lutheran teachers, namely, that the descent of Christ into hell was according to His soul only. An adjustment concerning these doctrines should not offer unusual difficulties if the various proof-texts are carefully examined.³⁾

Pneumatology.—The doctrines treated under this category may be among the most difficult to adjust, for they include in particular conversion and election. With regard to both points both Holy Writ and the Lutheran Confessions are certainly clear and comprehensive enough. With regard to conversion this attitude is generally reflected in recent confessional statements of the Lutheran bodies in this country. As stated in the *Report* of the Ohio Synod of 1920, the National Lutheran Council in regard to conversion adopted the statement: "Conversion, as the word is commonly used in our Lutheran

2) Our position is stated in the writings referred to above; also *Lehre und Wehre*, October, 1919; *Theol. Monthly*, February, 1924.

3) Our position is stated in *CONCORDIA THEOL. MONTHLY*, I, 810. 888; II, 244; III, 826 ff.

Confessions, comprises contrition and faith, produced by the Law and the Gospel. If a man is not converted, the responsibility and guilt fall on him, because he, in spite of God's all-sufficient grace through the call, would not, according to the words of Christ in Matt. 23, 37." (P. 132 ff.) Recent utterances very decidedly favor the understanding that the synergism of both Melancthon and of Latermann have been rejected. "Since conversion begins with a sinner who is both unwilling and unable to believe and ends with the same sinner both willing and able to believe and actually doing so, it is clear that the transformation is one which must be ascribed entirely to the working of the Holy Spirit and not to any natural powers of man. . . . We reject . . . the synergistic position, which holds that the Holy Ghost must begin the work of conversion, but that then man is able by his own powers to complete it. The fact is that, from beginning to end, conversion is due to the agency and activity of the Holy Spirit, and not at all to any natural powers of man. There is indeed a certain activity of man in the process, since it is an ethical one; but that activity is produced by the Holy Spirit and is exercised by means of powers which the Holy Spirit has bestowed and not by means of any which are native or natural to man. Hence the entire work of conversion is to be ascribed to the Holy Spirit. . . . Regarded as a process culminating in contrition and faith, conversion is gradual. On the other hand, regarded as a transition from a state of unbelief to one of faith, it is instantaneous, inasmuch as there is a moment when the man ceases to be an unbeliever and has become a believer." (Stump, *The Christian Faith*, 257 f.) If this position is consistently and unequivocally held by all Lutheran bodies and teachers, with a complete denial of man's ability "to decide for salvation through new powers bestowed by God," also any and every *facultas se applicandi ad gratiam*, any *status intermedius* in which the *motus praeparatorii* are spoken of as a part of the spiritual enlightenment and ascribed to man, then these various bodies are in the way of being perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment.⁴⁾

But it is right here that the greatest care will have to be exercised lest a false understanding of the doctrine of the eternal election of God become a pitfall which will once more precipitate men into the abyss of synergism. It is essential that every Lutheran church-body and every Lutheran theologian adhere firmly to the Bible and to the Formula of Concord. The Chicago Theses (A. L. C.) of March, 1919, referred to above, say of election: "The causes of election to salvation are the mercy of God and the most holy merit of

4) Our position is stated in CONCORDIA THEOL. MONTHLY, I, 561 ff. 818 ff.; II, 170 ff. 826 ff.

Christ; nothing in us on account of which God has elected us to eternal life. On the other hand, we reject all forms of Calvinism, which directly or indirectly would conflict with the order of salvation and would not give to all a full and equally great opportunity of salvation, which says that God would have all men to be saved and to come unto the knowledge of the truth. 1 Tim. 2, 4." (*Loc. cit.*, 123 ff.) — So far, so good. But while the statement as it stands is Scriptural and important, it does not distinguish between God's will of Redemption, which pertains to all men, and His decree of Election, which pertains to the chosen only. And if we want to remain strictly with the Bible and the Formula of Concord, we are compelled to forsake the *intuitu fidei* of some of the Lutheran teachers. The notion of a consequent will of God, namely, one "consequent upon God's foreknowledge of those who will believe," leads to a hopeless confusion and invariably introduces synergistic elements. It causes statements like these: "In the last analysis, predestination is simply the eternal justification of the sinner for Christ's sake. . . . God foreknows that John Smith will enduringly believe and hence [?] elects, or predestinates, him to salvation." And again: "*Erst wird berufen; dann wird erwählt. Wuerde erst erwählt und dann berufen, dann koennte niemand mehr dem Worte Gottes trauen noch dem Eid des Sakraments glauben. . . . In ihm [Jesu] sind hernach alle erwählt, die nicht durch ihr Nein verhindern, dass aus ihrer Berufung die Erwählung wird.*" Such confusion is the result of not simply taking Scripture as it reads, of not saying with the Formula of Concord: "Since God has reserved this mystery for His wisdom and has revealed nothing to us concerning it in His Word, much less commanded us to investigate it with our thoughts, but has earnestly discouraged us therefrom, Rom. 11, 33 ff., we should not reason in our thoughts, draw conclusions, nor inquire curiously into these matters, but should adhere to His revealed Word, to which He points us." (*Conc. Trigl.*, 1081, § 55.)⁵⁾

Ecclesiology. — With regard to the doctrines of the Church and the ministry we have this interesting phenomenon, that only certain aspects or phases of the difficulties connected with their presentation are found in the Lutheran Confessions, chiefly in the definitions of the holy Christian Church (Augustana, Art. VII. VIII), of the ministry of the Word (Art. V), of ecclesiastical order (Art. XIV), of ecclesiastical usages (Art. XV), of ecclesiastical power (Art. XXVIII), with the respective parts in the Apology, and the treatise "Of the Power and Primacy of the Pope" appended to the Smalcald Articles. It is true that the doctrine of the Church and of the Christian ministry is contained in the Confessions, but chiefly with

5) Our position is stated in CONCORDIA THEOL. MONTHLY, III, 8 ff.

reference to conditions as they obtained at the time of their writing. The point of view is that of opposition to the hierarchy, and therefore it is necessary to study the principles contained in the arguments. In a similar way, the student of the dogmatists must constantly keep in mind the point of view of the state church, of consistories, and other evidences of a non-democratic polity if he would understand the principles involved. From this it follows that the safest course to follow is that of studying the principles laid down in the Lutheran Confessions in the light of the Word of God. The writings of Luther will also be of great value in this connection. It will soon appear that the word *ekklesia*, if used of a visible organization, is consistently used of the congregation, as the unit of the so-called visible Church, that apostolic practise recognized the independent or autonomous character of the individual congregation, and that the admission to, and the dismissal from, the church was made a function of the individual congregation. Hence it is the members of the congregation who have charge of the ministerial office in their midst, whether we want to speak of a transfer of the office or not, and no larger body, or combination, of Christians has legislative or executive powers with respect to the local congregation. — A close adherence to these truths will eliminate such statements as the following: "The Synod has legislative, not merely advisory powers," or: "Let us get rid once for all of the unscriptural [?] idea that every congregation is complete in itself. The Church is not the arithmetical sum of a number of units; it is a unity in itself." Such expressions confuse the notions of the *una sancta* and the visible churches which bear the same name and tend to lead to hierarchical conceptions of church government, whether this be in the form of an episcopal government with executive powers, of a synodical organization with legislative functions, or of a bureaucracy with an administrative jurisdiction infringing upon God-given rights.⁶⁾

Eschatology. — With regard to the doctrines of this section most of the difficulties of the first decades of controversy seem to have been removed. The statement of the Augustana (Art. XVII) concerning the Jewish opinions "that before the resurrection of the dead the godly shall take possession of the kingdom of the world, the ungodly being everywhere suppressed" has succeeded in making enough of an impression to drive out all gross chiliasm and also many of its finer forms. There is good reason therefore for believing that a more careful study of the respective passages of Holy Scripture will eliminate also the finer conceptions of millennial glory, such as the

6) Our position is stated in CONCORDIA THEOL. MONTHLY, II, 886 ff.; III, 23 ff.; *Lehre und Wehre*, October, 1916; 1923, 297 ff. 360 ff.; 1925, 171 ff.

statement that "the truths of Christianity will become dominant and by reason of the government of Christ and the Church of the first-born the kingdom will be a kingdom of righteousness and justice," also that "the Jews shall be converted to Christ . . . , that the Jews as a whole shall have been turned from their unbelief to faith in Christ as the Messiah." And as for the Antichrist: While the chief proof-text is 2 Thess. 2, it must not be forgotten that additional features found in Daniel and in the Apocalypse very definitely connect the reign of Antichrist with the city of Rome. While the last-named doctrine is not a fundamental doctrine, it is a touchstone for Lutheran consciousness.⁷⁾

Practical Questions Based upon Doctrinal Considerations.— Having considered the doctrinal points which will have to be reviewed very carefully by the various Lutheran bodies if ultimate unity and union is to be the goal, we turn our attention to questions which are more in the domain of church practise, although also connected most closely with clear demands of Scripture.

There we encounter, first of all, the vexing problem of *unionism* itself, that is, the confederation or the merging of church-bodies without a basis of true spiritual unity. We find some very encouraging statements regarding the right position on this problem. In the *Report* of the former Ohio Synod for 1918 we read: "Much as an organic union is desired, we, in agreement with our worthy President, declare we can never enter into union with any Lutheran synod unless we agree in doctrine and practise, especially at this time, when the unionistic spirit is threatening to creep into our Lutheran Church." (P. 121.) In the Toledo Theses of the former Iowa Synod the statement is made: "Full agreement in all articles of faith constitutes the irremissible condition of church-fellowship. Persistent error in an article of faith must under all circumstances lead to separation. . . . Those who knowingly, obdurately, and persistently contradict the divine Word in any of its utterances whatsoever, thereby overthrow the organic foundation (of the faith), and are therefore to be excluded from church-fellowship." (Neve, *Loc. cit.*, 450.) The same stand is taken in the Minneapolis Theses of 1925: "Mutual recognition, altar- and pulpit-fellowship, and eventually co-operation in the strictly essential work of the Church, presupposes unanimity in the pure doctrines of the Gospel and in the confession of the same in word and deed. Where the establishment and maintenance of church-fellowship ignores present doctrinal differences or declares them a matter of indifference, there is unionism, pretense of a union which does not exist." (*Theol. Monthly*, VII, 113.) Dis-

7) Our position is stated in CONCORDIA THEOL. MONTHLY, II, 241 ff. 641 ff.; *Lehre und Wehre*, 1925, 237 ff.

regarding the somewhat unsatisfactory expression "in the strictly essential work of the Church," it surely is most encouraging to find the principles of the Word of God set forth so emphatically. If declarations of this kind, which are found in the reports of other Lutheran bodies also, are consistently followed, the outlook for an agreement in fundamentals, in fact, in every statement of Scripture, is very bright.⁸⁾

With regard to the evil and menace of *lodgery* the position of most Lutheran bodies of our country, at least in theory, is in accordance with the Word of God. In the theses adopted by the National Lutheran Council, as reported in the minutes of the Ohio Synod for 1920 (p. 132 ff.), we read: "Any association or society which has religious exercises from which the name of the Triune God or the name of Jesus as a matter of principle is excluded or which teaches salvation through works must, according to Holy Scripture, be regarded as in its very nature incompatible with the faith and confession of the Christian Church, and more especially the Lutheran Church, whether this be realized or not." And the Minneapolis Theses of the bodies now merged in the American Lutheran Church declare: "These synods agree that all such organizations or societies, secret or open, as are either avowedly religious or practise the forms of religion without confessing as a matter of principle the Triune God and Jesus Christ as the Son of God come into the flesh and our Savior from sin or instead of the Gospel teach salvation by human works or morality, are antichristian and destructive of the best interests of the Church and the individual soul and that therefore the Church of Christ and its congregations can have no fellowship with them." (*Theol. Monthly*, VII, 114.) The weakness of the theses is found in the next section: "They agree that a Lutheran synod should not tolerate pastors who have affiliated themselves with any anti-christian society," for it is hard to tell on the basis of the statement in the previous paragraph why only pastors should be dealt with. Nevertheless it seems plain that the possibility of an agreement also in this question is not remote.

A few other questions which will have to be discussed and settled according to the Word of God are those of the celebration of Sunday, which cannot be said to be divinely commanded, certain questions of marriage and divorce, particularly the validity of a rightful betrothal, the value of John's baptism, and a number of other points, chiefly in the field of Christian ethics.

We have discussed the difficulties within the Lutheran church-bodies of America in a very open way, for it is best to see clearly

8) Our position is stated in CONCORDIA THEOL. MONTHLY, I, 321 ff. 498 ff.; II, 565.

what the trouble consists in, as only thus will those who love the peace of Zion be able to apply the proper remedies. The obstacles may seem formidable, but they surely are not insurmountable. The Missouri Synod has presented its position to the whole world. There seems to be no reason why free conferences should not discuss the proposed basis of doctrinal agreement with a view of eventually coming to a full agreement on the basis of the Word of God.

P. E. KRETZMANN.

Präsidialrede.

Verehrte Väter und Brüder der Synodalkonferenz, teure Glaubensgenossen!*)

Es ist sonst nicht Sitte bei den Versammlungen der Synodalkonferenz, daß eine besondere Eröffnungs- oder Präsidialrede am Anfang der Sitzungen nach der Organisation gehalten wird. Nicht einmal bei der allerersten Versammlung geschah dies. Die Eröffnungspredigt galt als Eröffnungsrede, wie schon in dem ersten gedruckten Bericht hervorgehoben, daher denn auch die Eröffnungspredigt im Druck mitgeteilt wird. Wenn der Vorsitzende sich diesmal erlaubt, eine Ausnahme zu machen und mit einer kurzen Ansprache die Sitzungen einzuleiten, so hat dies seinen Grund in der Tatsache, daß es dieses Jahr gerade sechzig Jahre her sind, daß die Synodalkonferenz zu ihrer ersten Versammlung zusammentrat und dies die einfachste Weise schien, an diese Tatsache zu erinnern.

Vom 11. bis zum 13. Januar 1871 war nach längeren Vorberhandlungen eine Konvention von Vertretern der Synoden von Ohio, Missouri, Wisconsin und der nordwestlich-lutherischen Synode in Chicago abgehalten worden, auf der der Entwurf einer Form der Vereinigung dieser Synoden beraten worden war. Vom 14. bis zum 16. November desselben Jahres hatte dann eine zweite Vorversammlung in Fort Wayne getagt, zu der sich auch Glieder der Synoden von Illinois und Minnesota eingefunden hatten. Auf dieser Vorversammlung wurde die beabsichtigte Konstitution nochmals besprochen und zugleich revidiert, und es wurde beschlossen, diese Konstitution in den Blättern der betreffenden Synoden zu veröffentlichen und den Synoden vorzulegen, worauf dann auf Grund dieser Konstitution die Synodalkonferenz ins Leben treten sollte. Zugleich wurde dieser Versammlung eine Denkschrift vorgelegt, in der die Gründe dargelegt waren, weshalb die betreffenden Synoden sich nicht an eine der bereits bestehenden Verbindungen von Synoden zu

*) Diese Rede wurde in der ersten Sitzung der Synodalkonferenz in Mantato, Minnesota, am 10. August 1932, gehalten und sollte im gedruckten Bericht erscheinen. Da dieser der Kosten wegen auf das Allernötigste beschränkt werden muß, wird sie hier ihres historischen Inhalts wegen mitgeteilt.

einem Synodabund angeschlossen hätten, sondern durch den Zusammentritt zu einer Synodalkonferenz eine gesonderte kirchliche Körperschaft zu gründen vorhätten.

Von der ersten dieser Versammlungen heißt es in einem öffentlichen Bericht darüber, daß die Verhandlungen „in innig brüderlicher Liebe“ gepflogen worden seien (Lutheraner 27, 82), und von der zweiten Vorversammlung, die von 67 Pastoren und Professoren, 2 Gemeindepastoren und 9 Schullehrern besucht war, berichtete Balthier im „Lutheraner“ (28, 36): „Wir reden die Wahrheit, wenn wir hierdurch versichern, daß diese Konvention in Fort Wayne an jenes Bild der Kirche erinnerte, welches der heilige Lukas mit den Worten entwirft: ‚Die Menge aber der Gläubigen war ein Herz und eine Seele‘, Apost. 4, 32. Es handelte sich hier nicht darum, Einigkeit erst herzustellen, viel weniger, durch allerlei erzwungene gemeinsame Beschlüsse und Formeln den Schein solcher Einigkeit nach außen hervorzubringen, sondern der bereits vorhandenen Einigkeit nur Ausdruck zu geben. Mit Freuden erkannten die Gegenwärtigen, daß nicht Menschenrat und Kirchenpolitik, sondern wirklich Einigkeit des Glaubens und Bekenntnisses sie zusammengeführt habe, damit das innerlich Ge-einte auch äußerlich durch das Band des Friedens verbunden erscheine. Allerdings erschien es bisher berechtigt, wenn die Feinde der Treue gegen das lutherische Bekenntnis in Lehre und Praxis höhnisch erklärten, daß diese Treue nur Spaltung hervorrufe; aber Gott, der nichts von seinen Haushaltern fordert, als daß sie treu erfunden werden, hat bis hieher geholfen, daß nun jedermann erkennen muß, daß Treue gegen sein heiliges Wort nicht trennt, sondern wahrhaft einigt. Wir verhehlen uns zwar keinesweges, daß in den verschiedenen die Synodalkonferenz befürtwortenden Synoden noch gar manche Gebrechen sich finden, welche die Einigkeit zu stören drohen, aber durch Gottes Gnade sind alle diese Synoden auf demselben rechten Wege zum einen rechten Ziele; sie schämen sich ebensowenig, ihre Mängel einzugestehen, als das Ziel anzuerkennen, dem sie nachzujagen haben. So wird es denn auch Gott, der verheißen hat, daß er es den Aufrichtigen gelingen lassen wolle, denen gelingen lassen, welche der Wahrheit die Ehre geben, obgleich zum Wollen das Vollbringen noch hinzukommen muß.“

So trat nun im folgenden Jahre die Synodalkonferenz ins Leben und hielt ihre erste Versammlung ab vom 10. bis zum 16. Juli 1872 in Milwaukee, in der St. Johanniskirche P. J. Badings von der Wisconsin-synode. Prof. C. F. B. Balthier von der Missouri-synode hielt die Eröffnungspredigt über 1 Tim. 4, 16 und wies in dieser Predigt darauf hin, „wie wichtig es sei, daß wir vor allem die Seligmachung der Seelen zu dem Endzweck unserer gemeinsamen Arbeit im Reiche Christi machen“. Prof. M. Loh von der Ohio-synode leitete die Besprechungen über die Frage: „Was ist unsere Aufgabe der englischen Bevölkerung unsers

Landes gegenüber?" Besonders aber referierte Prof. F. A. Schmidt von der Norwegischen Synode über die Lehre von der Rechtfertigung, und die Konferenz widmete diesem Gegenstande sieben ihrer Sitzungen. Ein Komitee stellte dann Sätze auf und legte einen Bericht ab über Innere Mission, die nach eingehender Besprechung angenommen wurden. Konstituierende Glieder der Synodalkonferenz waren die sechs Synoden, die sämtlich durch beglaubigte Delegaten vertreten waren: Ohioynode, Missourisynode, Wisconsinynode, Norwegische Synode, Illinoisynode und Minnesotasynode. Alle damaligen Delegaten sind nun eingegangen zu der Ruhe des Volkes Gottes; auch von den zahlreichen sonstigen Besuchern und beratenden Gliedern ist wohl keiner mehr am Leben außer dem betagten norwegischen P. Wibbey, der als Student an den Sitzungen teilnahm. Aber namentlich sind auch unter den konstituierenden Synoden der Synodalkonferenz in den verflossenen sechzig Jahren mancherlei Veränderungen vor sich gegangen. Die Ohioynode, der sich im Jahre 1877 die seit 1876 zur Synodalkonferenz gehörende Synode von Virginia als Distrikt angeschlossen hatte, trat im Jahre 1881 aus der Synodalkonferenz aus wegen des Streites über die Lehre von der Gnadenwahl; im Jahre 1883 ebenso die Norwegische Synode, um den in ihrer Mitte schwebenden Streit leichter beizulegen; sie unterhielt jedoch immer, namentlich in späteren Jahren, freundschaftliche, glaubensbrüderliche Beziehungen zur Synodalkonferenz, die aber trotz aller Vorstellungen der Synodalkonferenz durch ihre Vereinigung mit andern auf einem andern Lehrstandpunkt stehenden norwegischen Körperschaften 1917 gelöst wurden. Die Illinoisynode vereinigte sich 1880 mit dem Illinois-Distrikt der Missourisynode; die Minnesotasynode ging 1892 eine Vereinigung ein mit der Wisconsinynode und bildet nun einen Distrikt derselben. Infolge des Gnadenwahllehrstreits bildete sich die Concordiasynode aus ausgetretenen Gliedern der Ohioynode und schloß sich 1882 der Synodalkonferenz an, löste sich aber später wieder auf und vereinigte sich 1886 mit der Missourisynode. Die Englische Synode von Missouri schloß sich im Jahre 1888 der Synodalkonferenz an, wurde jedoch 1911 ein Distrikt der Missourisynode. Die Michigansynode ging im Jahre 1892 eine Vereinigung mit der Wisconsinynode ein, wurde Glied der Synodalkonferenz und bildet nun nach Kämpfen in ihrer eigenen Mitte, in denen auch die Synodalkonferenz zu handeln hatte, einen Distrikt der Wisconsinynode. Die Distriktsynode von Nebraska, aus Gemeinden und Pastoren der Wisconsinynode bestehend, schloß sich 1906 der Synodalkonferenz an und bildet jetzt ebenfalls einen Distrikt der Wisconsinynode. Aus der alten Norwegischen Synode traten eine Anzahl Pastoren und Gemeinden um des Bekenntnisses willen aus und schlossen sich 1920 als neue Synode der Synodalkonferenz an. Ebenso war die Slowakische Synode schon 1906 der Synodalkonferenz beigetreten, so daß diese seit 1920 bis zum heutigen Tage aus vier Synoden besteht: der Missourisynode mit dreißig Distrikten, der Wisconsinynode mit acht

Distrikten, der Slowakischen Ev.-Luth. Synode von Amerika und der Norwegischen Ev.-Luth. Synode. Und die Synodalkonferenz unterhält glaubensbrüderliche Beziehungen zu freikirchlichen Synoden in Deutschland, Elsaß-Lothringen, Finnland, Polen und Australien.

Darüber sind nun sechzig Jahre ins Land gegangen. Menschen sind gekommen und gegangen: Bading, Ernst und Hönede von der Wisconsin-synode, Balthar, Wynken, Sihler und Schwan von der Missouri-synode, Preuß und Koren von der Norwegischen Synode, Siefer von der Minnesotasynode, die alle Delegaten bei jener ersten Versammlung waren. Kirchliche Verbindungen sind in der Synodalkonferenz in den verfloßenen sechzig Jahren geschlossen, gelöst und verändert worden. Aber durch Gottes Gnade ist die Synodalkonferenz selbst geblieben und ist geblieben, was sie war, eine Konferenz lutherischer Synoden, die es mit dem Bekenntnis zu Gottes Wort und zu den Symbolen der lutherischen Kirche ernst nehmen und in keinem Stücke davon weichen wollen. Die Synodalkonferenz ist geblieben, was sie war, auch in den Zeiten heißer Kämpfe, wie ihre kurz ange deutete Geschichte zeigt. Sie hat heute noch denselben Zweck und dasselbe Ziel, wie sie es im Jahre 1872 im dritten Paragraphen ihrer Konstitution niedergelegt hat: „Äußerer Ausdruck der Geisteseinigkeit der betreffenden Synoden; gegenseitige Stärkung im Glauben und Bekenntnis; Förderung der Einigkeit in Lehre und Praxis und Beseitigung vorkommender drohender Störung derselben; gemeinschaftliche Tätigkeit für die gemeinsamen Zwecke; Anstrebung einer Abgrenzung der Synoden nach territorialer Grenze, vorausgesetzt, daß die Sprache nicht scheidet; Vereinigung aller lutherischen Synoden Amerikas zu einer rechtläubigen amerikanisch-lutherischen Kirche.“ Sie hat heute noch auch dieselben Gegenstände der Tätigkeit, wie sie im fünften Paragraphen genannt werden: „Kirchliche Lehre und Praxis; Verhältnis der Prediger und Gemeinden der einen Synode des Verbandes zu denen einer andern; Verhältnis des ganzen Körpers und einzelner Teile desselben zu kirchlichen Körperschaften außerhalb seines Verbandes; Angelegenheiten Äußerer und Innerer sowie der Immigrantennmission; Kranken- und Waisenhausache; lutherische Literatur im allgemeinen und lutherisches Traktatenwesen insbesondere; Sache der Ausbildung von Predigern und Schullehrern und dergleichen.“ Ist noch nicht jedes einzelne Stück erreicht und vielleicht infolge veränderter Verhältnisse weniger im Vordergrund der Bestrebungen, so sind andere auf derselben Linie liegende Stücke dazugekommen. Es braucht nur erinnert zu werden an das feste Zusammenhalten der jetzigen Synoden im Gnadenwahllehrestreit, an das Zusammenarbeiten in dem großen, ausgedehnten Werk der Negermission, an das gemeinsame Wirken der geistlichen Versorgung unserer Soldaten im Weltkrieg und an das andauernde, beständige Bemühen, die Einigkeit im Geiste zu erhalten und aufsteigende Schwierigkeiten in brüder-

licher Weise zu besehen und zu beseitigen. Dafür sei Gott bei einem solchen Ruhepunkt in der Flucht der Zeit, wie es dieses Jahr des sechzigjährigen Bestehens ist, von Herzen Dank gesagt. Er wolle nach seiner Gnade mit uns sein, wie er gewesen ist mit unsern Vätern, und weiterhin Treue, Einigkeit, Brüderlichkeit, Liebe geben und erhalten! Und dazu dienen ganz besonders auch die zweijährlichen Versammlungen, wie wir zu einer solchen jetzt wieder zusammengekommen sind. Das ist die Erfahrung aller, die diesen Versammlungen wiederholt beigewohnt haben.

Gott sei uns gnädig und segne uns; er lasse uns sein Antlitz leuchten! Er lehre uns tun nach seinem Wohlgefallen, denn er ist unser Gott; sein guter Geist führe uns auf ebener Bahn! Sein Wort sei unsers Fußes Leuchte und ein Licht auf unserm Wege! Amen.

L. Fürbringer.

Studies in Eusebius.

The slurs of Gibbon have been answered by many Christians, especially by Milman, Dean of St. Paul's. The chief aim of Gibbon was to belittle the motives and heroism of the martyrs, to call in question the accounts of witnesses like Lactantius and Eusebius, and to excuse or mitigate the action of those responsible for the persecutions. In the present paper my aim is to examine with care the procedure and methods of Eusebius. The most striking feature of his manner of work is this: He has preserved for us many contemporary documents, the value of which cannot be belittled or explained away by any fair criticism. It is true, we should like to know more of the common Christians, of the laity, of the actual services of the Christian congregations. The incessant series of heresies and heresiarchs, in my opinion, would have been impossible if the Bible had been as common and familiar to all as it came to be after the invention of printing by Gutenberg, before the Reformation. Also the development of hierarchy gave a dangerous preponderance to the rulers of the churches, who really were not less subject to the authority of the Word than the common Christians. The bishops gradually became dynasts and the laymen subjects. I will now merely transcribe some of the passages from Gibbon, chaps. XV and XVI, without any comments or polemic, in which the real attitude of the famous Voltairian¹⁾ reveals itself.

But first I must copy Dean Milman's note, appended to the beginning of Gibbon's chaps. XV and XVI: "The art of Gibbon, or at least the unfair impression produced by these two memorable chapters, consists of confounding together in one undistinguishable mass the

1) See Leslie Stephen on Gibbon, in *British Biography*. On this whole subject compare my work *From Augustus to Augustine*, Cambridge, 1923, especially the chapters dealing with Diocletian, Julian, and Augustine.

origin and *apostolic* propagation of the Christian religion, as dexterously eluded or speciously concealed. His plan enables him to commence his account, in most parts, *below the apostolic times*; and it is only by the strength of the dark coloring with which he has brought out the failings and the follies of the succeeding ages that a shadow of doubt and suspicion is thrown back on the primitive period of Christianity. Divest this whole passage of the latent sarcasm betrayed by the subsequent of the whole disquisition, and it might commence a Christian history in the most Christian spirit of candor."

Now a few passages from Gibbon: "The Jewish converts, who acknowledged Jesus in the character of the Messiah foretold by their ancient oracles" . . . "the doubtful and imperfect faith of modern ages." "It is this deep impression of supernatural truths which has been so much celebrated under the name of faith—a state of mind described as the surest pledge of the divine favor and of future felicity and recommended as the first or perhaps the only merit of a Christian." Now follows a passage almost identical with one written by Julian the Apostate (*From Augustus to Augustine*, p. 214): "Whatever corrupter (*φθορεύς*), whatever blood-guilty person there be, let him come forward with confidence; for with this water here [of Baptism] having washed him, I will at once exhibit him as clean; and if for a second time he becomes liable for the same things, I will grant to him that, after beating his breast and striking his head, he may become clean."

Does Gibbon allude to this passage in Julian? "It is a very ancient reproach, suggested by the ignorance or the malice of infidelity, that the Christians allured into their party the most atrocious criminals, who, as soon as they were touched by a sense of remorse, were easily persuaded to wash away, in the water of Baptism, the guilt of their past conduct, for which the temples of the gods refused to grant them an expiation." Again, he says in the same chapter (XV): "Very different was the reasoning of our devout predecessors. Vainly aspiring to imitate the perfections of angels, they disdained, or they affected to disdain, every earthly and corporeal delight." "The ecclesiastical governors of the Christians were taught to unite the wisdom of the serpent with the innocence of the dove; but as the former was refined, so the latter was insensibly corrupted by the habits of government." Gibbon computes that before the "important conversion of Constantine" only one-twentieth part of the population of the Roman Empire had turned Christian. (P. 152, Vol. 2, Bigelow & Co., New York.) I consider this estimate wildly improbable.

Again (p. 156): "The names of Seneca" (who defended the matricide Nero), "of the elder and younger Pliny, of Galen, of the slave Epictetus, and of the Emperor Marcus Antoninus adorn the age in which they flourished and exalt the dignity of human nature."

Of Gibbon's chapter XVI Milman wrote (p. 160): "The sixteenth [chapter] I cannot help considering a very ingenious and specious, but very disgraceful extenuation of the cruelties perpetrated by the Roman magistrates against the Christians. It is written in the most contemptibly factious spirit of prejudice against the sufferers; it is unworthy of a philosopher and a man of humanity. Let the narrative of Cyprian's death be examined. He [Gibbon] had to relate the murder of an innocent man of advanced age and in a station deemed venerable by a considerable body of the provincials of Africa, put to death because he refused to sacrifice to Jupiter. Instead of pointing the indignation of posterity against such an atrocious act of tyranny, he dwells with visible art on the small circumstances of decorum and politeness which attended this murder and which he relates with as much parade as if they were the most important particulars of the event."

But let us now turn to Eusebius (*Historia Ecclesiastica*) directly. It was finished after July 25, A. D. 325, and published before the end of A. D. 326 (Fynes Clinton, *Fasti Romani*, Vol. I, p. 379. Oxford, 1845), at a time coincident with the Council of Nicaea, when the position of the Christian religion had become free, at least officially so, by the Decree of Milan, 313.

There are two characteristic features in the favorite interests of Eusebius, chronology and, as I intimated, actual citation of contemporary documents, such as letters of churchmen. A church, or episcopal district, is often designated not as *ἐκκλησία*, but as *παροικία*, a place of "sojourning" among strangers, a passing home in a strange land, for which we may compare the situation of Israel in Egypt, Acts 13, 7. (Cf. 1 Pet. 1, 17.) He eagerly uses Josephus, especially when he can find a confirmation or illumination of Christian history, as, e. g., II, 10, the death of Herod Agrippa at Caesarea, in 44 A. D., Acts 12, 19—23, where Eusebius makes a heavy citation from Josephus, *Antiq.*, XIX. The greater detail in the Jewish historian curiously confirms and illumines the briefer narrative of Luke. We learn this: Herod Agrippa gave games in honor of Emperor Claudius. On the second day of the festival Herod Agrippa entered the theater, early in the morning, clothed in a garment of silver texture, which reflected the rays of the morning sun. "At once the flatterers from one or the other side cried out utterances not good, even for him, *calling him god*, adding, May you be generous unto us!" (Clearly these were *not* Jews, but Greeks. — *E. G. S.*) "If up to now we feared you as a human being, from now on we confess that you are superior to mortal nature." After five days of intense abdominal suffering the king died, in his fifty-fourth year, having ultimately ruled over the tetrarchy of Philip and the district governed by Herod, both under Caligula and Claudius. The famine in Judea, also under Claudius, relieved from Antioch,

through Paul and Barnabas (Acts 11, 29. 30), Eusebius sees confirmed by Josephus. Like Justin, Eusebius confounded the figure of Semo Sancus at Rome with Simon Magus of Samaria. Justin, when at Rome, misread the inscription at the base of the statue.

Eusebius, *H. E.*, II, 15, Peter and Mark at Rome, now, as by Zahn, set not so early, but in 64 A. D., under Nero, when the great conflagration was followed by the cruel persecution under Nero. (Cf. 1 Pet. 5, 13.) Neander assumed "Babylon" to be that on the Euphrates and *συνηλεχτή* to be the wife of Peter. Cf. also 1 Cor. 5, 9.

The digressions by Eusebius (II, 17, 18) on certain works by Philo Judaeus I have read and reread, but I cannot understand the pertinency of this excursus — in the history of the New Testament, or that Philo met Peter at Rome, a tradition it is true (Eusebius II, 17), but exceedingly unlikely. We read also (E., II, 18) that the works of Philo, by action of the Senate, under Claudius, were placed in libraries (at Rome — perhaps the Apollo library on the Palatine?).

One outstanding feature in the studies of Eusebius: He does not seem to have been familiar with *Latin* documents or authorities, such as Tacitus, *Annals*, XV, 44, when relating the fire at Rome and the terrible persecution through Nero of the Christians, 64 A. D. When we examine Eusebius, II, 25, he incorrectly combines the martyrdom of both Paul and Peter with that conflagration. The Vatican region and the Via Ostiensis were indeed always associated with the martyrdom of both, but Paul seems to have visited Spain after his acquittal in the first trial.

Let us now turn away to the general estimation of the Christians as presented by Tacitus and his younger friend, Pliny the Younger. I have discussed the former's record (*Ann.*, XV, 44) quite fully in *Biblical Review*, April, 1928, and must now limit myself to a few phrases: "*Quos per flagitia invisos vulgus Christianos appellabat.*" "Shameless deeds," or "practises" — what did the pagan public mean? The fraternal kiss? or the *agapae*, the love-feasts? or that they scrupulously refused to appear at games, theaters, and the endlessly recurring festivals which marked the Roman calendar? Thus "*odio generis humani*" might be understood, perhaps, from this rigorous abstention. More light may come from the official correspondence between Emperor Trajan and Pliny, then proconsul of Bithynia and Pontus, probably 104 A. D. (Fynes Clinton). Eusebius, III, 33, does report the matter, but at second hand (from Tertullian, says Fynes Clinton; still I find that Tertullian reproduced Pliny's report very exactly and correctly). On the whole, it seems best to present completely my own version of this famous document in the history of early Christianity (*Plin. Ep.*, X, 96): —

"It is a customary matter with me, O Master, to refer to you all things about which I am in doubt. For who can better either direct

my hesitation or equip my ignorance? I have never been officially present [*interfui*] in trials concerning Christians;²⁾ therefore I do not know what and how far it is wont to be either punished or investigated. And I have hesitated not a little whether there is some distinction of ages or whether persons of no matter what tender age should not differ from the stronger; whether pardon should be given to repentance or whether to him who altogether has been a Christian his having ceased to be shall not be advantageous; whether the name itself, if it be free from the shameless practises associated with the name [*flagitia cohaerentia nomini*; cf. Tacitus, above, *Ann.*, XV, 44]. Meanwhile I have in the case of those who were reported to me as Christians followed this procedure: I asked them personally [*ipsos*] whether they were Christians. If they confessed it, I asked them again, and for a third time, threatening them with execution [*supplicio*]. When they persevered, I ordered them to be led to execution. For I did not doubt, no matter what it was they had confessed, that their stubbornness surely and their inflexible obstinacy must be punished. There were others of similar folly, whom, because they were Roman citizens, I marked as people who should be sent to the City [Rome].³⁾ Soon in the very prosecution, as is wont to come about, the charge spreading, more forms occurred. There was published a pamphlet [*libellus*], anonymous, containing the names of many. Those that denied that they were Christians or had been, when, on my uttering the form, they accosted the gods and with incense and wine made worship to your image, which on this account I had ordered to be brought in, together with figures [*simulacra*] of the gods, and furthermore blasphemed Christ, none of which things, it is said, they can be compelled to do who really are Christians, I thought they must be discharged. Others, named by an informer, said that they were Christians and soon denied it, [saying] they had been, but had ceased to be, some three years ago, some more years, certain ones even twenty years before. These also, all of them, worshiped both your image and the figures of the gods and blasphemed Christ. They deposed that this had been the total of their guilt or error, that they had been accustomed on a stated day to meet before daylight [*ante lucem*], to utter a chant to Christ, as to a god, in turn [*invicem*],⁴⁾ and to bind themselves by an oath, not to some crime or other, but that they would not commit theft, highway robbery, adultery, that they would not break their word, that they would not deny a deposit when called upon.⁵⁾ Having done this, it had been their custom to separate and

2) Since 64 A. D. or even before? The persecution under Domitian also had preceded.

3) Like St. Paul, by Festus, Acts 25, 12.

4) Probably antiphony and responsorium; cf. 1 Tim. 3, 16.

5) Perhaps the recitation of the Ten Commandments.

meet again to take food,⁶⁾ but of a kind that was common and harmless; which itself they had ceased to do after my edict, in which, according to your orders, I had forbidden that there be any association [*hetairias*]. The more necessary I deemed it to inquire from two maids, who were called deaconesses [*ministrae*], even by torture [*per tormenta*], what was true. I found nothing but silly and boundless superstition. Therefore, postponing trials, I have resorted to consult you. For the matter seemed to me worthy of consultation, especially on account of the number of those who are endangered [in Eusebius, from Tertullian, Pliny: *ταραχθεις τῷ πλήθει*, III, 25, who are endangering themselves]. For many of every age, of every social grade, of both sexes also, are incurring risk and will do so. The contagion of that superstition has spread not only through towns, but also through villages and the open country [*agros*], which, it seems, can be stopped and reformed. Surely it is a well-established fact that temples, almost now forsaken, have begun to be attended, and the stated sacrifices, long dropped [*diu intermissa*], are again being performed and that the grazing of sacrificial animals has a market [once more], of which until now a very rare purchaser was found. Hence it is easy to form an opinion what a multitude of men [*turba hominum*] can be set right [*emendari*] if there be space for repentance."

Of the emperor's decision I will quote but a main point: "They must not be looked up; if they be brought before you and found guilty on examination, they must be punished, thus, however, that he who denies that he is a Christian and makes it concretely [*re ipsa*] clear, that is, by worshiping our gods, although he was suspected in the past, shall obtain pardon upon his repentance."

So it is clear that under Trajan consistent confession of Christ was no more nor less than a capital crime, or high treason against the state. We see distinctly how the precedent was set by Trajan (considered one of the best emperors in the Roman annals), how political and civil loyalty was now bound up with the traditional idolatry; to deny these gods was to deny the authority of the state, deified since Augustus in the deceased emperors.⁷⁾

But to return to our special task. The chief concern of Eusebius, or one of his chief concerns, is this: to keep a list of bishops, with the greatest possible accuracy of names and the chronology of their sequence on their "thrones," whereas we evangelical Christians would be more interested to learn of the practical spread of the Scriptures in the congregations. Returning now to some important data, we observe that for the fall of Jerusalem, 70 A. D., Eusebius (III, 6) makes heavy

6) The *agape*? or Communion?

7) Exceptions: Tiberius, Caligula, Nero, the three pretenders who preceded Vespasian, and the last of the Flavians, Domitian.

citations from Josephus and tells us that the Christians in time had withdrawn to Pella in Perea⁸⁾ (III, 5). Eusebius quotes the words of our Lord, Matt. 28, 19, and also τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως, the prediction of all the horrors by the Savior Himself, Matt. 24, 15,⁹⁾ forty years before the catastrophe, as Eusebius computes the chronology.

His great interest is in "succession," as in III, 4, — Gentile Christians in the New Testament are generally called οἱ ἐξ ἐθνῶν, while Jewish Christians are designated as οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς, — and he cites the introductory words of 1 Pet. almost verbatim: "the diaspora of Pontus and Galatia, Cappadocia and Asia" (the Roman province of which Ephesus was the capital).

He calls the persecution under Domitian the second (III, 17). Now it seems from secular authors that Domitian was always afraid of a new "king" and that he turned against the Christians because they considered Christ their King, in a spiritual, not in a political sense. So he summoned to Rome some descendants of King David from Palestine (Eusebius, III, 20, from Hegesippus). *Delatores* had informed against them as being grandsons of James, the brother of Christ. (On this nuisance of the *delatores*, the professional informers, see Tacitus, *Annales*, IV, 30.) They were conveyed to Rome; but when the tyrant learned of their modest little farms and saw their horny hands, he abandoned his fear and suspicions. These farmers confessed Christ as the future Judge of the quick and the dead. Hegesippus said that Domitian issued a decree to stop the persecution in 95 A. D. or so, not long before he himself was slain and the Roman aristocracy was freed from its cruel oppressor. St. John then returned from Patmos to Ephesus. The term "synoptic" gospels may be due to a view long established before the time of Eusebius. (I quote from III, 24: "The other three evangelists, one may survey jointly [*συνιδεῖν πάρεσσι*].") They begin with John the Baptist and chiefly relate the happenings occurring after the imprisonment of the Baptist. It is an odd idea of Dean Alford that John was not acquainted with the three other gospels. Passing here over Eusebius, III, 25: the "homologumena" and "anomologumena," the *Antilegomena*, the spurious (*νόθοι*) and the "fraudulent" books, we clearly realize that the dates of death or martyrdom of the leaders became soon, of course, a part of the Christian calendar and that their burial-places were an object of veneration, as the tomb of St. John at Ephesus. The term *ἐνδιάθητος* (III, 25) of a canonical book — what does this adjective mean?

8) Named from the town of Macedon.

9) When we reflect on the data which I cited from Tacitus and Pliny, we are arrested by the prediction of the Master made in the very last days before His suffering, Mark 13, 13: "You will be hated by all on account of *My name*."

Perhaps this: a book which is in, which belongs to, the New Testament, the *καινή διαθήκη*.

I now come to the long list of the bishops of Jerusalem (Euseb. IV, 5). Eusebius says that the dates of the incumbency and succession of fifteen bishops were not recorded. Beginning with James, the brother of the Lord, the list ended with the siege of Jerusalem in Hadrian's reign, the furious insurrection under Barcochba, 132—135 A. D., at the conclusion of which Jerusalem was renamed Aelia Capitolina. Now, Eusebius collectively calls these fifteen bishops "the bishops from circumcision." Are we to assume that circumcision was actually practised up to 132 A. D. among Palestinian Christians alongside of baptism? It is not credible. It seems wiser to interpret that term as an ethnic designation; they were of Jewish descent, they were nationally Jews.

Now, one of Gibbon's favorite theses is to reduce the difference of Jews and Christians as much as possible, whereas the Jews under privileges decreed in writing, from Caesar and Augustus onward, had a *religio licita*, the Christians, *not*; the Jews, *qua* Jews, were not subjected to persecution, the Christians were. Stephen the deacon, the first Christian martyr, was slain — by whom? Not by the Romans; no, by the Jews. In like manner both James, the son of Zebedee, and James the Just, brother of the Lord, were executed, one by Herod Agrippa, 44 A. D., the other by the high priest Annas, a few years before the Jewish War. I will now give the list of the fifteen bishops, from Eusebius, IV, 5: James, "said to be the brother of the Lord," Symeon, Justus, Zacchaeus, Tobias, Benjamin, John, Matthias, Philip, Seneca (a curious appropriation of the name made famous for the first time by the Roman Stoic and author), Justus, Levi, Ephres, Joseph, Judas. They cover not much more than eighty years or so, the episcopate of them all averaging not much more than five to six years. Excepting the first, no writing seems to have come from any of them. Did Hadrian make a law that Aelia Capitolina should be inhabited only by non-Jews?

One of the barest forms of classical paganism is the deification and worship of Hadrian's favorite Antinous; a town named for him, temples, and games (Euseb., IV, 8). I myself in Rome (1912) read inscriptions dealing with this worship. "All began," wrote Justin, quoted by Eusebius, "from fear to worship him as a god, knowing who he was and whence he came."

This was the time when the Platonist Justin, just referred to, began to change to Christ. Eusebius cites him directly: "For I myself, too, rejoicing in the teachings of Plato, hearing the Christians abused and seeing them also fearless in facing death and all things considered dreadful, conceived the idea that it was impossible that they lived in wickedness and love of pleasure. For what voluptuary or person that

is incontinent or deems good the devouring of human flesh would be able to welcome death in order to be deprived of his own appetites, but would not endeavor in every way always to live the life here and to escape the notice of the rulers, let alone reporting himself as one that was to be put to death?"

Here I may add to the full account what Minucius Felix says in his *Octavius*, IX, 2 sqq. (cf. *From Augustus to Augustine*, pp. 51—53). "We, too," says the Christian Octavius, "believed the monstrous stories about the Christians, stories which were so bruited about, but never investigated or proved." And the pagan point of view or attitude is well set forth also: "Do not the Romans hold sway and rule without your God, do they not enjoy the whole world and are your masters? But you are in suspense and anxiety, you do not visit shows, you do not share in parades." . . . We begin to understand why the Christians were not understood, nay, hated by the pagan world in which they lived, striving to keep themselves spotless from it. In IV, 9 Eusebius presents in a Greek version a decree of the emperor Hadrian advising the proconsul of Asia (the province) at Ephesus, Minucius Fundanus, not to listen to professional informers making accusations against the Christians. We have every reason to believe that such governmental documents were copied, preserved from bishops to bishops, throughout the Roman Empire.

Justin's *First Apology*, drawn on by Eusebius, is dated by Fynes Clinton 151 A. D. (under Antoninus Pius). Dr. Gildersleeve of Johns Hopkins, in 1877 (Harper's), published both *Apologies*, and I take great pleasure in quoting from his Introduction (p. XXII): "The bold, as some might think, the audacious, tone of the *Apologies* has led some to fancy that they are not what they claim to be, actual documents intended for the eye of the emperor and the senate; but Justin was no holiday Christian, and it is inconceivable that a man who vindicated his faith with his blood should have shrunk from utterances which, after all, did not go beyond the boldness of a Peregrinus, to say nothing of the imaginary speeches of Apollonius of Tyana. To suppose that these *Apologies* are mere academic performances is to overlook the license accorded to the philosopher; is to shut the eyes to the earnestness of the Christian life of the century." Justin's description of the Gnostic leader Marcion of Pontus, in chap. 26 of the *First Apology*, is notable, but we cannot dwell on it now.¹⁰ The familiarity of Justin with the history, the religion, and the philosophy of the classical world is impressive; it is precise, fair, and comprehensive and cannot but command the admiration of every classical scholar. The references and quotations from the New Testament are frequent and striking. The virgin birth of Christ is spoken of in

10) Cf. *From Augustus to Augustine*, 1923, pp. 127, sqq. 134 sqq.

chaps. 22 and 46. A few citations are offered. He writes: 'We alone are hated on account of the name of Christ, and while doing no wrong, we are put to death as criminals, while others elsewhere worship even rivers¹¹⁾ and mice and cats, and not the same ones honored by all, but by some here and by others there, so that they all are impious to one another because they do not worship the same. That alone have you to charge against us, viz., that we do not worship the same gods as you do nor bear to the dead libations and incense and to paintings¹²⁾ wreaths and sacrifices. For the same objects with some are esteemed gods, with others wild beasts, and with others sacrificial animals,¹³⁾ as you know precisely.' Of the outrages on elementary moral sense conveyed in many elements of Greek mythology (Ganymede, Adonis, etc.) he wrote with great freedom (chap. 25). Sometimes a definite Scriptural reminiscence seems to guide his pen, as when he speaks of this, that men, with their deep recognition of good and evil, cannot have any excuse (Rom. 1, 20; 2, 1, ἀναπολόγητον). The reference to Baruch and the hatred of the Jews for the Christians is found in chap. 31; Bethlehem and the assessment records under Quirinius, chap. 34; the prophecy of the Lord's Passion in Ps. 22, chap. 35. All, says he, may be learned from the Acts (*Acta*) of Pontius Pilate (chap. 48). He dwells much on Is. 53 (chap. 51). The bulk of actual Christians came from the pagans (chap. 53). Of many direct and indirect quotations from John's gospel (as in chaps. 61—63) we have no time to speak nor of what he says about Baptism (chap. 61), the eternal Godhead of Christ (chap. 63), and the Eucharist (chap. 66). But I will close this digression on Justin by presenting an important passage which may serve as a complement to Pliny's report to Trajan (X, 96) presented below (chap. 67): "And on the so-called Sunday a meeting of all who dwell in towns or country takes place in the same spot, and the records of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read as long as time permits. Then, when the reader has ceased, the leader (*ὁ προσεπὶς*) in a discourse presents the admonition and call for the imitation of these noble things. Then we all jointly arise and utter prayers. And as we have said before, when we have ceased our prayer, bread is served and wine and water, and the pastor (*ὁ προσεπὶς*) equally sends up prayer and thanksgiving as far as he is able, and the people (*ὁ λαός*) give assent by uttering the amen, and the distribution and the sharing in the food that has been blessed takes place for each one, and to those not present a part is sent through the deacons. Of those who are wealthy and are willing each gives according to his own purpose (*προαίρεσιν*), and what is gathered is deposited with the pastor,

11) In Egypt.

12) The text has *γραφαῖς*. Perhaps we should read *ταφαῖς*.

13) Perhaps Justin had in mind the Apis of the Egyptians.

and he himself aids the orphans and the widows and those in prison and strangers sojourning there; in a word, he [the pastor] becomes a caretaker for all who are in need. On Sundays we all jointly hold our meeting, since it is the first day on which God, changing darkness and matter, created the world and Jesus Christ, our Savior, on the same day rose from the dead; for on the day before, that of Saturn, they crucified Him, and after the day of Saturn, which is Sunday, having appeared to His apostles and disciples, He taught them those things which for your consideration we have presented to you, too."

In 161 A. D. Marcus Aurelius, the Stoic, succeeded to the imperial throne at Rome. It was becoming more and more difficult to guard the frontier of the Danube and the Euphrates. The emperor's night thoughts *To Himself* are before us; among the elements of his self-examination he mentions his "reverence for the gods."¹⁴ During his reign, in 166, occurred the martyrdom of Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, who was then eighty-six years of age. Polycarp had in his youth heard the Word of God from the Apostle St. John. Eusebius has preserved for us a precious document, the official narrative drawn up by the church at Smyrna for the churches in Pontus. As Polycarp entered the city, some of his pagan friends tried to save him, urging him to utter simply the words "Lord Caesar" and to sacrifice to Caesar. In vain. He was then conducted to the Stadium. The arrest of Polycarp made a great sensation. The proconsul made the usual efforts to make him recant. "Swear to the Emperor's fortune," he told him. Say, "Away with the atheists!" This particular sentence Polycarp indeed repeated, but refused to blaspheme Christ; he cut short all further insistence on the part of the proconsul to deny Christ by saying, "I am a Christian." The proconsul threatened to have him cast before the wild beasts and then to have him burned at the stake. The aged bishop replied by referring to the Judgment and what will follow it. The proconsul then had the herald proclaim to the people assembled in the Stadium, from the center, "Polycarp has confessed that he is a Christian," whereupon the multitude of pagans and Jews cried out, "This man is the teacher of Asia, father of the Christians, destroyer of our gods, who teaches many not to sacrifice nor to worship." Then they all shouted and demanded that he be burned. The crowd surged in from the workshops and the baths, bringing fuel; especially the Jews were eager to see him suffer such a death. He was tied to the stake. He then uttered his last prayer, which ended thus: "through the eternal High Priest Jesus Christ, Thy blessed Son, through whom to Thee with Himself and the Holy Spirit be glory now and in all eternity. Amen." As the burning lasted long, the "confector"¹⁵ was called and told to stab him to death. Polycarp

14) Cf. *From Augustus to Augustine*, p. 45.

15) *Qui bestias in amphitheatris conficiebat*.

was the twelfth martyr at Smyrna. The anniversary of his death became a holiday for the Christians at Smyrna and in the province.

The exact year of Justin's martyrdom at Rome is not known, but it seems to have occurred in the reign of Marcus Aurelius (Eusebius, IV, 16). The cynic Crescens was the bitter enemy of Justin, who had defied him in his *Second Apology*, chap. 3, which Eusebius cites. It seems that Justin had had public disputes with him at Rome.

New York, N. Y. (To be concluded.)

E. G. SIHLER.

Luther und das Sub Utraque.

Unter den Vorwürfen, die gegen Luther erhoben worden sind, findet sich auch die Anklage, daß er starrköpfig und rechthaberisch gewesen sei, und daß darum nur wenige mit ihm hätten auskommen können. Dem gegenüber ist aber geltend zu machen, daß sein Verhältnis zu seinen Mitarbeitern ein überaus herzliches und inniges war. Die Schilderungen von Veit Dietrich, Georg Rörer und besonders von Johann Mathesius geben uns eine wesentlich andere Vorstellung von dem Reformator, nämlich die eines Mannes, der im wahren Sinne des Wortes demütig und selbstverleugnend war.

Auf der andern Seite wird Luther aber auch, und zwar gerade von manchen seiner Freunde, verdächtigt, als habe er den Irrtum zu lange getragen, so daß er sich dadurch schließlich fremder Sünden teilhaftig gemacht habe. Da dieser Vorwurf gegen Luther sonderlich wegen seiner Stellung in der Lehre von beiderlei Gestalt erhoben worden ist, wird es sich der Mühe lohnen, die in Betracht kommenden Stellen in seinen Schriften sowohl wie in seinen Briefen etwas näher anzusehen. Dies gibt uns zugleich einen Einblick in den theologischen Werdegang des Reformators, eine Riesenleistung, die bisher von nicht allzu vielen Lutherforschern recht eingeschätzt worden ist.

Die erste Behandlung der Frage vom heiligen Abendmahl findet sich in Luthers „Sermon von dem hochwürdigen Sakrament des heiligen wahren Leichnams Christi und von den Bruderschaften“. Diese Schrift war laut eines Briefes vom 29. November 1519 an Spalatin an diesem Tage im Druck (XXIa, 207) und erschien Anfang Dezember 1519 in Wittenberg bei Johannes Grunenberg. Hier spricht sich Luther gleich in den ersten Paragraphen über das sub utraque aus, und zwar in einer Weise, die anzeigt, daß er damals selber noch nicht zur Klarheit in der Frage gekommen war. Er schreibt: „Denn das Sakrament oder Zeichen muß empfangen oder je begehrt werden, soll es Nutzen schaffen. Wiewohl man jezt nicht beider Gestalt dem Volk alle Tage gibt wie vorzeiten — ist auch nicht not —, so niehet ihrer doch alle Tage die Priesterschaft vor dem Volk, und ist genug, daß das Volk sein täglich begehre und zur Zeit e i n e r Gestalt, so viel die christliche Kirche ordnet

und gibt, empfahe. Zum dritten, es ist aber bei mir für gut angesehen, daß die Kirche in einem gemeinen Concilio wiederum verordnete, daß man allen Menschen beide Gestalt gebe, wie den Priestern. Nicht darum, daß eine Gestalt nicht genug sei, so doch wohl allein des Glaubens Begierde genug ist.“* (XIX, 428.) Nebenbei gesagt, hielt Luther damals noch an der Verwandlungslehre fest. Daß Luther seiner Sache in bezug auf das sub utraque damals noch nicht gewiß war, als in der Einsetzung Christi klar gegeben, zeigt sein Nachwort in der Wittenberger Ausgabe von 1520, wo er schreibt: „Es sind etliche, die diesen Sermon ohne alle Not verworfen haben, darum daß ich im dritten Artikel gesagt habe: Es dünkt mich fein, wo ein christlich Concilium verordnete, beide Gestalt jedermann zu geben; haben auch das Maul weit aufgetan, daß sie sagen, es sei Irrtum und ärgerlich. . . . Doch bitte ich, sie wollten den andern und dritten Artikel recht ansehen, darin ich klar gesagt, es sei eine Gestalt genug.“ (Kol. 429.)

Trotz der großen Vorsicht Luthers aber erregte seine Empfehlung, man solle durch ein Konzil das Sakrament unter beider Gestalt wieder einführen lassen, großen Widerspruch. Herzog Georg von Sachsen beklagte sich am 27. Dezember bitter bei seinem Vetter Kurfürst Friedrich über das „gedruckt Büchlein“ des Doktor Martin Luther mit Hinweis auf einen Bericht, „daß über sechstausend Menschen in Böhmen unter beider Gestalt mehr sind worden denn vor Zeit seiner Predigt“. (XIX, 451.) Der Kurfürst antwortete aber am 29. Dezember in ausweichender Weise: „Biewohl ich nicht achten kann, wofür das berührte Büchlein will angesehen werden, so höre ich doch, daß bisher desselben Martinus Lehre bei viel Gelehrten und Verständigen für christlich gehalten und gehalten worden.“ (Kol. 452.) Vier Wochen später, am 26. Januar 1520, erschien Luthers „Erklärung etlicher Artikel in seinem Sermon vom hochwürdigem Sakrament des heiligen wahren Leichnam Christi“, worin er gleich zu Anfang sagt: „Ich habe einen Sermon aus lassen gehen von dem hochwürdigem heiligen Sakrament des Altars, darin unter andern Worten ich mich habe merken lassen, daß mich's gut dünkt, so man beider Gestalt gäbe jedermann, der sein begehret.“ (XIX, 452.) Dann redet er erklärend: „Ich habe nicht gesagt noch geraten, ist auch nicht meine Meinung, daß einer oder etliche Bischöfe von eigener Gewalt sollten anheben, beide Gestalt jemand zu reichen, es würde denn also gesetzt und befohlen durch ein gemein christlich Concilium, welches ich nämlich ausgedrückt habe.“ Insofern war Luther damals noch im alten Wesen befangen. Und doch drängt sich die Wahrheit mit Gewalt hervor, wie es weiter im fünften Paragraphen heißt: „Sage ich weiter, daß beider Gestalt nießen für Kezerei achten langet zur Schmach Christi und ist eine Lästerung des heiligen Evan-

*) Sperrdruck durchweg von uns.

gellii und desselben Sakraments. Denn Christus hat's selbst in beider Gestalt eingesetzt und die ganze Kirche in aller Welt viel hundert Jahre lang also gebraucht, das niemand leugnen mag." (Kol. 454.) In der weiteren Ausführung aber zeigt Luther wieder, daß er noch zu sehr unter dem Einfluß der kirchlichen Gewalt steht und darum die Austeilung sub una zu Recht bestehen lassen will.

Daß Luther während der nächsten Monate im großen und ganzen bei diesen Ausführungen stehenblieb, zeigt die Korrespondenz zwischen ihm und Spalatin, auch nachdem das Dekret des Bischofs von Meissen wider seinen Sermon ausgegangen war. Er will die Tatsache der Einsetzung unter beiderlei Gestalt nicht geleugnet sehen, wiederholt aber seinen Vorschlag, die Kommunion unter beiderlei Gestalt einem Konzil anheimzustellen. (Vgl. das Verzeichnis der einschlägigen Schriften Luthers, XIX, 486—489.) Die Summa seiner Stellung gibt er selber an in den Worten: „Ich habe nicht gelehrt, man soll beide Gestalt reichen, ob mich's wohl gut dünkt; denn ich habe mein Dünken niemand zur Regel oder Lehre gesetzt, sondern mit ausgedrückten Worten vorgezogen ein gemein christlich Concilium, wo dasselbe würde solches verordnen, daß also denn beide Gestalt würde nach desselben Concilii Ordnung gehorsamlich gereicht." (Kol. 464.)

Am 3. August 1520 erschien Luthers „Sermon von dem neuen Testament, das ist, von der heiligen Messe“. Er redet hier schon zum Teil mit größerer Sicherheit, denn unter seinen Anklagen gegen die Römischen wegen der verschiedenen Greuel der Messe findet sich auch der folgende Passus: „Danach haben sie uns die eine Gestalt des Weins gar genommen, wie wohl nicht viel daran gelegen ist, denn es mehr an den Worten denn am Reichen gelegen ist. Doch wollte ich gerne wissen, wer ihnen die Gewalt geben hat, solches zu tun.“ (XIX, 1063.) Man sieht, es ist ihm noch kein klares Lehrprinzip, um das er kämpft; er wagt noch nicht, eine Forderung zu stellen. Seine Stellung wurde auch wesentlich nicht anders, als er in seiner Schrift „Von der babylonischen Gefangenschaft der Kirche“ vom Oktober des Jahres 1520 mit bezug auf Emsers Angriffe schreibt: „Bisher habe ich Tor gemeint, es würde schön sein, wenn durch ein allgemeines Konzil festgesetzt würde, daß den Laien das Sakrament unter beiderlei Gestalt gereicht werden solle. Indem der mehr als übergelehrte Mönch diese Meinung verbessern will, sagt er, es sei weder geboten noch geraten, weder von Christo noch von den Aposteln, daß den Laien beiderlei Gestalt gereicht werden solle. . . . Du fragst vielleicht, was für eine Tollheit den Menschen bewegt oder gegen wen er schreibt, da ich den Gebrauch einer Gestalt nicht verdammt und es dem Urteil der Kirche überlassen habe, den Gebrauch von beiderlei Gestalt einzusetzen.“ (XIX, 8.) Aber doch wagte er in der eigentlichen Ausführung „Vom Abendmahl des Herrn“, bedeutend weiterzugehen, wo er nämlich schreibt: „Wenn es [das Sakrament] zugleich auch den Laien gegeben

ist, so folgt sofort unvermeidlich, daß den Laien beiderlei Gestalt nicht versagt werden dürfe. Wenn man sich nun weigert, dieses denen zu geben, die darum bitten, so handelt man gottlos und wider Christi Tat, Beispiel und Einsetzung. Ich gestehe, daß ich, durch diesen Grund, der für mich unüberwindlich ist, überwunden, weder etwas gelesen noch gehört noch gefunden habe, was ich dawider sagen könnte, da hier Christi Wort und Beispiel überaus fest steht, wo er nicht zu Lassungs-, sondern gebotsweise redet: „Trinket alle daraus.“ Denn, wenn alle trinken sollen und es nicht so verstanden werden kann, daß es allein den Geistlichen gesagt sei, so ist es sicherlich gottlos, daß die Laien, welche es begehren, davon abgehalten werden, wenngleich ein Engel vom Himmel dies täte.“ (Kol. 16.)

Luthers Verständnis von der Abendmahlslehre klärte sich während der nächsten Monate, so daß er mit viel größerer Parrhesie die Wahrheit vertrat. Dies geht schon aus seiner Gründonnerstagspredigt vom 28. März 1521 hervor, wo er ganz und gar unter der Voraussetzung redet, daß das Sakrament unter beiderlei Gestalt ausgeteilt und empfangen wird. (XII, 1354 ff.) Dasselbe gilt von seiner Schrift „Vom Mißbrauch der Messe“, worin er die eigentlichen Irrlehren und Greuel der päpstlichen Messe angreift und bloßstellt. (XIX, 1068 ff.) Später machte Luther der römischen Irrlehre von der *communio sub una* ganz entschieden keine Konzessionen mehr. Am Gründonnerstag, den 14. März 1522, predigte er in Wittenberg über das Thema „Vom Sakrament des Altars überhaupt“, und in dieser Predigt führte er klar aus: „Allhier sehen wir auch, daß Christus beide Gestalten eingesetzt hat, Leib und Blut. Darum, wenn unsere Papisten mich fragen würden: Ja, beide Gestalten sind nur den Priestern gegeben? so sprich du: Nein. Werden sie sprechen: Hat er sie denn den Laien gegeben? so sprich auch: Nein. Je, wem hat er's dann gegeben? So sprich: Er hat's weder Priestern noch Laien gegeben, sondern seinen Christen. Denn diese Sekte ist in den Christen nicht gewesen, allein die Papisten haben sie ausgerichtet; sie werden's auch nicht beweisen aus der Schrift, daß Christus die Apostel zu Priestern geweiht hat, denn es ist eitel Traum, ohne alle Schrift und Grund.“ (X, 2167.)

Einige Tage später hatte Luther seine Schrift unter den Händen „Meinung von beider Gestalt des Sakraments zu nehmen und anderer Neuerung“, die am 17. April im Druck vollendet war. Wie die Überschrift schon angibt, ist diese Schrift eine ausführliche Darlegung der Schriftlehre von beiderlei Gestalt. Es findet sich aber dabei ein neuer Gedanke, auf den wir sonderlich achtgeben müssen, wenn wir gewisse spätere Aussprüche Luthers verstehen wollen. Er stellt nämlich selber die Frage, warum er nicht auf einmal reine Bahn gemacht habe und nicht überall auf die Einführung der *communio sub utraque* bringe, auch nicht in Wittenberg. Er antwortet: „So sehe ich, daß der Satan

damit umgeht, er wolle beider Gestalt ja so gemein machen und noch gemeiner, denn der Papst seine eine Gestalt gemacht hat, ehe denn Christen gemacht werden, die solches tun sollen; und gedenkt's auf der rechten Seite ärger zu machen denn auf der Linken. . . . Das Gefängnis aber ist also getan, daß der gemeine Mann durch päpstliche Tyrannei und Geseze im Gewissen so hart verstrickt und geschwächt ist am Glauben, daß er's nicht kann so plötzlich fahren lassen und sein Gewissen festigen, daß des Papsts Ding unrecht und dieser Brauch recht und evangelisch sei. Habe doch ich selbst wohl drei Jahre mich gearbeitet, ehe ich aus des Papsts Gesezen mein Gewissen erlöst habe mit täglicher Übung des Evangelii, in Predigen, Lesen, Betrachten, Disputieren, Schreiben und Hören; wie sollte denn der gemeine Mann so schnell herauszubringen sein? Wo nun solche schwache Menschen hingehen und beider Gestalt nehmen, so heißt sie darnach ihr Gewissen und beichten, daß sie haben beider Gestalt genossen, als hätten sie übel daran getan. . . . Bötticher müssen wir zuerst werden und neue Fässer machen, ehe die Weinernte angeht und der Most gesaft werde; die alten müssen beiseitegetan werden, das ist, man muß stark und viel predigen wider des Papsts Gesez von einer Gestalt und wohl treiben die evangelische Einsetzung Christi von beider Gestalt. Aber indes das Volk abweisen von dem ganzen Sakrament, es sei einer oder beider Gestalt, und nicht hingutreiben, weder auf Ostern noch auf Pfingsten, und also die Ordnung des Papsts fallen lassen also lange, bis die Leute, genugsam verständigt, ohne Roden und Reizen, sondern, aus eigenem Gewissen getrieben, von ihnen selbst kommen und [ein jeglicher] darnach ringe und dringe, daß ihm das Sakrament gegeben werde." (XX, 75 ff.)

Hiermit kommen wir auf die Sache zu sprechen, die manchem Lutherleser aufgefallen ist und ihm auch wohl Bedenken gemacht hat, nämlich daß Luther trotz seiner gewonnenen klaren Erkenntnis von der Abendmahlslehre doch nicht auf der allgemeinen und unbedingten Einführung des sub utraque bestand. Dies sehen wir aus einem Brief des Reformators vom 4. April 1524, in dem er Spalatin den folgenden Rat gibt: „Wenn jemand durch das Wort Gottes das Gewissensbedenken bekommen hat, daß er nicht eine Gestalt alleine nehmen kann, und doch sein Glaube so schwach ist, daß er aus Furcht vor den Menschen nicht wagt, beide Gestalten zu nehmen, so enthalte er sich einstweilen des Sakraments ganz und gar, da keine Gefahr dabei ist, wenn man das ganze Sakrament hat anstehen lassen." (XXIa, 608.) Diese Stellung Luthers kommt noch deutlicher zum Ausdruck in dem „Unterricht der Visitatoren an die Pfarrherren im Kurfürstentum Sachsen" vom Jahre 1528 und 1538. In dem Kapitel „Vom Sakrament des Leibes und Blutes des Herrn" heißt es: „Der andere Artikel ist: Daß sie die Leute unterrichten, daß es recht ist, beide Gestalten zu nehmen. . . . Dieweil aber gleichwohl niemand zum Glauben zu zwingen . . . und

dazu auch die Leute mancherlei gesinnt und geschickt befunden werden, daß es unmöglich gewesen ist oder noch ist, gewisse Maße oder Personen zu bestimmen, denen solche beide Gestalten nach der Lehre Christi zu reichen oder zu weigern sein sollten. Derhalben, ob wir wohl die Lehre rein und frei zu predigen leichtlich Unterricht geben mögen, als die Christus selbst gegeben, so haben wir doch den Brauch und Übung solcher Lehre nicht also in gewisse Maße, Weise oder Personen stellen können, angesehen, daß durch den allgemeinen Gebrauch einer Gestalt die Leute hart gefangen gewesen und noch wohl etliche sein mögen, die solches Brauchs halben etwas schwer zweifeln. . . . Auf's andere: Wo aber Schwache sind, die . . . ohne Halsstarrigkeit, aus Blödigkeit und Furcht ihres Gewissens nicht könnten beider Gestalt empfangen, die mag man lassen einerlei Gestalt noch eine Zeitlang genießen, und wo sie es also begehren, mag's ein Pfarrherr oder Prediger wohl denselben reichen. . . . Item: Es ist unfreundlich, ja unchristlich, solche Schwache zu zwingen zu beider Gestalt oder einerlei zu verweigern, denn damit werden sie zu sündigen gezwungen; nämlich, wenn sie beider Gestalt wider ihr Gewissen nehmen, so beichten sie's denn hernach und büßen als für eine große Kezerei, wie wir oft erfahren haben. Wiederum achten sie es für Kezerei, wenn sie einerlei Gestalt nach ihrer Gewohnheit nicht nehmen sollen, daß also auf beiden Seiten ihr schwacher Glaube sich mit großen Sünden, als Kezerei, wie wohl fälschlich, beschweret." (X, 1652 ff.) Hiermit hat Luther selber die Erklärung gegeben, warum er trotz eigener Lehrstellung nicht gewaltsam vorgehen wollte, nämlich um die Gewissen nicht zu beschweren und so das Werk der Reformation zu vereiteln. Es ist dieselbe Vorsicht, die ihn daran hinderte die Bilderstürmerei Karlsruh's zu billigen oder daran teilzunehmen.

Aber noch eine dritte Phase der geschichtlichen Entwicklung muß hier berücksichtigt werden, wenn wir die ganze Sache gerecht darstellen wollen, nämlich die, daß, nachdem die Wahrheit schon so allgemein verkündigt worden war, daß jedermann mit der reinen Lehre bekannt war oder doch Gelegenheit gehabt hatte, sie kennenzulernen, man doch unter falschen Vorwänden nicht das ganze Abendmahl halten wollte. Schon am 3. Juni 1523 schickte Luther an Graf Albrecht von Mansfeld seine Schrift „Unterricht und Beweis, daß die evangelische Lehre mit Mund und Tat zu bekennen und die Empfangung des Sakraments unter beider Gestalt aus Menschenfurcht nicht zu unterlassen sei". (X, 2210 ff.) In den folgenden Jahren häufen sich Schriften dieser Art. In Luthers Schrift „Trostschrift an die Christen zu Halle" von 1527 verbreitet er sich im ganzen zweiten Teil über die Notwendigkeit von beiderlei Gestalt des heiligen Sakraments, von Christo eingesezt, so daß keiner aus nützigen Verweggründen eine Entschuldigung hätte vorbringen können. Am 2. März 1528 schreibt Luther an Johann Rühel, daß der Gebrauch beider Gestalten im heiligen Abendmahl aus keiner Ursache zu unter-

lassen sei. Er bezieht sich dabei auf irgendeinen Vorwizigen, der wider bessere Erkenntnis den alten Brauch beibehalten wollte, und sagt: „Denn weil er weiß, daß Christus hat beide Gestalten eingesezt, so wird nicht helfen langer und alter Brauch, dawider gehalten, wie er selbst ohne Zweifel wohl ermessen kann, daß Gewohnheit und Wahrheit nicht gleich gelten.“ (X, 2214 ff.) Als der Bischof zu Halle die Christen zwingen wollte, das Sakrament wieder unter einer Gestalt zu feiern, trotzdem sie schon aus Überzeugung die *communio sub utraque* eingeführt hatten, gab er ihnen folgenden Bescheid: „Denn weil ihr nun des berichtet seid, daß es recht sei, beide Gestalten zu empfangen, und euer etliche bisher vielleicht auch also empfangen habt, wollte sich's nicht leiden hinfort, anders, denn was ihr recht erkennet, zu tun, weil wir nicht müssen unrecht oder wider Recht tun um jemandes willen, sondern Gott mehr denn den Menschen gehorsam sein.“ (X, 2220.) Als im Jahre 1530 während der Tagung des Reichstags in Augsburg Luther die Frage von der *communio sub una* vorgelegt wurde, besonders in dieser Form: „Wenn einer beide Gestalten begehrt und man ihm den Kelch nicht reichen will, ob's vor Gott entschuldigt sei, das Sakrament allein unter der Gestalt des Brots zu nehmen, oder ob er weiterziehen soll, da man's ihm gerne gibt?“ antwortete Luther: „Wo jemand den Kelch begehrt und ihm versagt wird, ist's nicht genug, daß er die eine Gestalt nehme, sondern ist besser, er gehe dahin, da man's ihm gerne reicht. Oder wo er das nicht tun kann, ist's besser, er lasse eine Gestalt fahren und genieße des Sakraments dieweil geistlich, nämlich indem er mit dem Glauben sein Gewissen stärket durch die Worte des Sakraments und Betrachtung des Herrn Leidens.“ (X, 2228 f.) Ebenso urteilte Luther im Jahre 1531 in einem Brief an die Christen zu Freiberg, in dem er sie ermahnte, im Bekenntnis des Sakraments unter beiden Gestalten zu beharren (X, 2218 f.), sowie im Jahre 1532 in einem Brief an Martin Lodinger: „Weil Ihr nun wiisset, daß es recht sei, das Sakrament ganz und nicht halb zu empfangen, so möget Ihr's mit gutem Gewissen nicht halb empfangen; es ist wegerer [besser], Ihr entbehret sein ganz und gar und befehlet Euch dieweil mit dem Glauben und Begierde zum ganzen Sakrament.“ (X, 2220 f.) Diese Zeugnisse könnten noch um Duzende vermehrt werden.

Welches Bild ergibt sich uns nun aus dieser Zusammenstellung von Darlegungen aus Luthers Schriften?

Wir erkennen zunächst, daß Luther selber erst nach langjährigem Studium zur Erkenntnis der Wahrheit kam, besonders zu der Gewißheit, daß hier eine Schriftwahrheit in Betracht kommt, die bekannt werden muß. Wie er sagt, hat ihm sonderlich der letzte Punkt viel Mühe gemacht, und er nimmt mit Recht an, daß weniger begünstigte Personen wohl kaum so schnell zur Klarheit und Gewißheit in dieser Lehre kommen können.

Mit dieser Auffassung Luthers hängt eng zusammen sein Wider-

streben, die Sache, was die Laien betrifft, auf die Spitze zu treiben und in irgendeiner Weise Gewissenszwang auszuüben. Er will unter allen Umständen die Schwachen schonen und die Gewissen unbeschwert lassen.

Aber dabei will er nicht gestatten, daß irgend jemand mit der bekannten Wahrheit Mutwillen treibt und unter falschen Vorwänden an der *communio sub una* festhält. Während er bereit ist, der Schwachen zu schonen, will er doch unter keinen Umständen eine Verleugnung der Wahrheit zulassen. Mit andern Worten, Luther bewies sich in der ganzen Verhandlung als geschickter Psycholog und gewissenhafter Seelsorger.

P. E. K r e z m a n n.

Die Hauptschriften Luthers in chronologischer Reihenfolge.

Mit Anmerkungen.

(Fortsetzung.)

1525. „Christliche Schrift an H. Wolsfg. Reichenbusch, sich in den ehelichen Stand zu begeben.“ — Diese kurze Schrift von nur zwölf Paragraphen schickte Luther am 10. April im Manuscript an Spalatin. Sie lag schon am 16. d. Mts. gedruckt vor. Reichenbusch war Präceptor zu Richtenberg und Mitglied des St. Antoniusordens. Besonders emphatisch sind folgende Bemerkungen in der Schrift: „Wer sich nun für einen Menschen hält und glaubt, daß er unter dem Wort Mensch begriffen sei, der höre hier, was sein Gott und Schöpfer über ihn beschließt und spricht: er wolle nicht, daß er einsam sei, sondern soll sich mehren, und schafft ihm dazu eine Hilfe, die um ihn sei und helfe ihm, daß er nicht einsam sei. . . . Lieber Gott, wir sehen täglich, wie große Mühe es kostet, daß man in der Ehe bleibe und eheliche Keuschheit halte, und wollen noch erst außer der Ehe, als wären wir nicht Menschen, hätten auch weder Fleisch und Blut, Keuschheit vornehmen?“ Es ist wohl anzunehmen, daß Luther in dieser Schrift die Argumente anführt, durch die er sich selbst bewegen ließ, ernstlich an seine eigene Ehe zu denken. Er reiste nämlich am 16. April nach Eisleben ab und kehrte am 6. Mai zurück. Daß sein Vater ihm entschieden zugeredet hat, in den Ehestand zu treten, erwähnt er wiederholt, und in einem Briefe an Rühel, den er am 4. Mai von Seeburg aus sandte, nennt er Katharina von Bora zum erstenmal seine „liebe Rätke“. (St. Louiser Ausgabe X, 674—679.)

1525. „Wider die räuberischen und mörderischen Rotten der Bauern.“ — Diese Schrift erschien in der ersten Woche im Mai. Sie ist ganz kurz (sechzehn Paragraphen), aber sie legt die Hauptpunkte dar, die gegen die aufrührerischen Bauern geltend gemacht werden mußten, nämlich „weil sie den Gehorsam brechen mutwilliglich und mit Frevel; . . . zum andern, daß sie Aufruhr anrichten, rauben und plündern mit Frevel Klöster und Schlösser; . . . zum dritten, daß sie solche schreckliche, greuliche Sünde mit dem Evangelio decken“. (St. Louiser Ausgabe XVI, 71—77.)

1525. „Ermahnung zum Frieden auf die zwölf Artikel der Bauernschaft in Schwaben.“ — Die Niederschrift dieser ausführlichen Darlegung, die sich einerseits an die Fürsten und Herren, andererseits an die Bauernschaft richtet, begann Luther im Garten des Kanzlers Dürer am 19. April 1525, und am 9. Mai wurde die Erscheinung der Schrift erwartet. Ihr letzter Teil behandelt die zwölf Artikel, die die Bauernschaft gestellt hatte, um ihre Forderungen zusammenzufassen. Besonders wertvoll sind die damaligen Ausführungen Luthers über das Recht der Gemeinde, einen Pfarrherrn zu wählen und zu entsetzen, und über die Leibeigenheit. Zum Schluß bringt Luther eine Vermahnung beide an die Obrigkeit und an die Bauernschaft. (St. Louiser Ausgabe XVI, 45—71.)

1525. „Sendschreiben an die Christen zu Antwerpen, sich vor den irrigen Geistern zu hüten.“ — Das wahrscheinliche Datum dieser Schrift ist der 28. April. Sie warnt mit bewegten Worten gegen einen „leibhaftigen Rumpelgeist“, der es darauf abgesehen hatte, die Christen zu Antwerpen zu verführen. Luther zählt acht Artikel auf, in die er des Irlehrers Lügen zusammenfaßt, unter diesen als siebten: „Das Gesetz wird nicht gebrochen mit böser Lust, solange ich nicht einwillige in die Lust.“ (St. Louiser Ausgabe X, 1526—1533.)

1525. „Eine schreckliche Geschichte und ein Gericht Gottes über Thomas Münzer.“ — Dies ist eine Sammlung kurzer Briefe oder Schriften, nämlich: ein Geleitsbrief für Graf Albrecht von Mansfeld vom 11. Mai 1525; ein sehr frecher Brief, den Münzer am 12. Mai 1525 an Graf Albrecht geschrieben hatte; Luthers Nachwort; Münzers Brief vom 12. Mai 1525 an die zu Frankenhäusen versammelten Bauern; Münzers sehr unverschämter Brief an den Grafen Ernst von Mansfeld vom 12. Mai 1525; D. Martin Luthers Vorrede zu der Schrift „Schreckliche Geschichte und Gericht Gottes über Thomas Münzer“. Die ganze Sammlung erschien in der zweiten Hälfte des Mai. Luthers Absicht bei der Herausgabe der Schrift ergibt sich aus der Vorrede: „zu vermahnem alle diejenigen, so seht Aufruhr und Unfriede treiben, und zu Trost und Stärke aller derer, so solchen Jammer sehen und leiden müssen“. Münzers zusammengewürfelter Haufe von Bauern und Bergleuten wurde am 15. Mai 1525 bei Frankenhäusen geschlagen, er selber am 30. Mai in Mühlhausen enthauptet. (St. Louiser Ausgabe XVI, Nr. 776—780. 793. Kol. 114 ff.)

1525. „Sendbrief von dem harten Büchlein wider die Bauern.“ — Diese Schrift erschien etwa Anfang Juli. Sie ist gerichtet an Kanzler Kaspar Müller von Mansfeld und ist wesentlich eine Verteidigung seiner Stellung im Bauernkriege. Der Gedanke, der sich durch die ganze Schrift zieht, wird von Luther so angegeben: „Sie meinen sie, daß sie es troffen haben; so sollte Luther gelehrt haben, daß man sich der Bauern erbarmt hätte; so lehrt er, man solle sie flugs töten. Wie dünkt dich? Daß sehen, ob der Luther über das Stücklein springen werde; ich meine, er sei gefangen.“ Er setzt sich mit beiden Anklagen auseinander. (St. Louiser Ausgabe XVI, 77—99. Nr. 770.)

1525. „Vermahnung an die Christen in Vivland vom äußerlichen Gottesdienst und Eintracht.“ — Diese Schrift trägt das Datum des 17. Juni 1525. Luther führt darin besonders zweierlei aus, nämlich auf der einen Seite die Notwendigkeit der Einigkeit in der Lehre vom Glauben, von der Liebe und vom Kreuz, in der Summa oder den Hauptstücken der Erkenntnis Christi, wobei aber die Freiheit in äußerlichen Ceremonien nicht beeinträchtigt werden darf, auf der andern Seite aber auch die Vorteile der einheitlichen Ordnungen. „Ob nun wohl die äußerlichen Ordnungen in Gottesdiensten, als Messen, Singen, Lesen, Taufen, nichts tun zur Seligkeit, so ist doch das unchristlich, daß man darüber uneinig ist und das arme Volk damit irremacht und nicht vielmehr achtet die Vesserung der Leute denn unsern eigenen Sinn und Gutdünken. . . . Denn, wie gesagt ist, obwohl die äußerlichen Weisen oder Ordnungen frei sind und, dem Glauben nach zu rechnen, mit gutem Gewissen an allen Orten, zu aller Stunde, durch alle Personen mögen geändert werden, so seid ihr doch, der Liebe nach zu rechnen, nicht frei, solche Freiheit zu vollziehen, sondern schulbig, acht darauf zu haben, wie es dem armen Volk leidlich und besserlich sei.“ (St. Louiser Ausgabe X, 258—263.)

1525. „Die sieben Bußpsalmen.“ — Dies ist die zweite Bearbeitung der Bußpsalmen, nachdem Luther sie 1517 zum ersten Male behandelt hatte. Er selber sagt in seiner Vorrede: „Unter meinen ersten Büchlein ließ ich dazumal auch ausgehen die sieben Bußpsalmen mit einer Auslegung. Und wiewohl ich noch nichts Schädliches drinnen finde gelehret, so ist doch oftmals des Textes Meinung gefehlt, wie denn pflegt zu geschehen am ersten Auszug, auch den alten heiligen Vätern, welche, wie Augustinus von sich bekennet, im Schreiben und Lehren sich täglich gebessert haben.“ Luther arbeitet durchweg mit dem hebräischen Text, wie das besonders aus seinen Anmerkungen hervorgeht. (St. Louiser Ausgabe IV, 1658—1743.)

(Fortsetzung folgt.)

P. E. R e m a n n.

Divorce and Malicious Desertion.

II. No Divorce, Except It Be for Fornication.

Fornication constitutes the one and only cause for obtaining a divorce, for severing the marriage bond. However, before the Christian congregation may sanction a suit for divorce on the grounds of fornication, it must be manifest that the person accused has actually committed fornication. The offense must be proved *de facto* and *de iure* to be *porneia*. It must be fornication *de iure*. A raped woman has not committed fornication; she has been the victim of a crime perpetrated against her will. Whether rape has occurred before or after betrothal or marriage, it will not afford the husband a cause for divorcing his wife or severing the betrothal. Unless the element of fraud enter, she is under no obligation even to reveal to her husband or betrothed the rape she has suffered before or after the marriage. Circumstances must decide whether it would be more advisable to reveal or conceal it.

Again, the person charged with fornication must be proved to be guilty *de facto*. The congregation must have evidence that he actually committed the sin of which he is accused. The fact of fornication must either be self-evident or self-confessed or proved by at least two witnesses, Matt. 18, 16. If, *e. g.*, a husband has had absolutely no opportunity for sexual intercourse with his wife for two years, and if immediately after the expiration of these two years his wife give birth to a child, it would be self-evident that she had committed adultery. The absence of her husband being established, it would not be necessary to furnish witnesses of the actual fornication. The confession of a woman that she has committed fornication will according to Matt. 12, 37; Luke 19, 22, establish her guilt before man, unless it can be proved that she lied. Yet her unsupported confession naming a man as the partner of her guilt will not establish the guilt of this man nor warrant the congregation to proceed against him as an adulterer nor permit his wife to divorce him, unless he himself pleads guilty to the charge. Wherever the guilt is neither self-evident nor self-confessed, the charge must be established by two witnesses, or the congregation dare not institute disciplinary proceedings against the party accused. We readily see that it may be very difficult to furnish or obtain proof in a case of alleged fornication; in many cases it may be impossible to substantiate the charge. In these cases the innocent party who suspects or knows of the guilt of the other spouse must commit the matter to the judgment of God; for no person has the right to raise a public charge, even though he has witnessed the act, unless he can procure at least one more witness. And the pastor must guard against harboring any suspicions against any person charged with fornication unless the proof has been fur-

nished. Else he would sin against the word of the Lord that none of us shall imagine evil in our heart against our neighbor, Zech. 8, 17. By no means should he permit himself to voice these suspicions, for that would be slandering and might involve him in a suit for malicious slander before the church or the civil courts. Even if he has been the witness of the act or the confession, but can prove neither the one nor the other, he has no right to raise the charge of fornication publicly; for that would be a manifest transgression of the rule laid down by Christ Matt. 18, 16, and again might easily involve him in serious consequences.

Olshausen feels that this commandment cannot possibly be carried out in the Church, and hence the Church of the New Testament, while endeavoring to educate its members to the high ideal pointed out by Christ, yet because of the hardness of the heart of many church-members would have to permit divorce on other grounds besides the one here specified. Olshausen, of course, had the State Church in mind when he wrote these words. In the Church of Christ the Word and will of Christ decide. Hard-hearted people do not belong to the Church, but must be excommunicated. If any congregation permits one of its members because of the hardness of his heart to divorce his spouse for any other reason than fornication, it commits a double sin. It fails to excommunicate a manifestly impenitent sinner, and it permits a divorce which Christ has clearly forbidden. "Whosoever divorces his wife, except it be for fornication, commits *adultery*." The State will divorce for other reasons, as we have seen, and other states may recognize this divorce and hold such a person blameless, yet before God he is an adulterer. And since the Church knows of no other norm than the Word of God, it will plead with every member contemplating a divorce for any other cause to desist from his course, and if he persists in it, the congregation will discipline and eventually excommunicate him. Before recognizing him again as a brother, it will insist that he return to his former wife wherever that is possible, even if it may mean the dissolution of a second marriage into which he has entered. This second marriage was not a marriage before God, but from its very beginning it was adultery, and adultery in its every act and manifestation.

Fornication, if established *de facto* and *de iure*, is, according to the words of the Savior, the one and only cause for obtaining a divorce, for severing what God has joined together. The innocent party applying for a divorce does not transgress the rule laid down by the Lord Matt. 19, 6. In this case it is not man severing what God has joined together, but the Lord Himself, having granted the permission, actually sanctions the severing of the bond if the innocent party makes use of the permission granted. We must bear in mind that the marriage bond is not severed by the act of fornication. It is not true

that this sin, abominable as it is, is "in its very nature the rupture of marriage," as the *Expositor's Bible* asserts in its remarks on Matt. 19, 9, or as Olshausen puts it: "Fornication is not a cause, a motive, for divorce, it is the actual separation itself, the annulment of the *σάρεξ μία*. As every *πορνεία* is forbidden already from the legal viewpoint by the Decalog, so naturally every marriage is actually annulled in which a *πορνεία* occurs." (Olshausen on Matt. 19, 9.) This view, wide-spread as it may be, is utterly false. The essence of marriage is not carnal intercourse, the becoming one flesh. That is one of the purposes of marriage, which consists in mutual consent to be husband and wife. Fornication is the grossest possible and most detestable violation of marital faithfulness, yet it does not necessarily rupture the bond of wedlock. "They twain" are still married, still husband and wife. If adultery could actually annul marriage, then a marriage continued after a case of adultery would no longer be a marriage, but adultery, since the two parties uniting would no longer be husband and wife.

Christ, however, does not *command* that the innocent sever the marital relation with the adulterer. He simply states that every divorce except for fornication is adultery. Hence a divorce because of this sin is not adultery. Christ therefore merely grants permission for divorce. While it is the duty of the wronged spouse to forgive the offense committed, there is, according to Christ's clear words, no obligation to continue the marital relation; for Christ distinctly gives to the innocent party the privilege of severing the marriage bond. Quite a different question is whether one will or should always avail himself of his right. The principle laid down by Paul in another matter applies here also: "All things are lawful unto me, but all things are not expedient," 1 Cor. 6, 12. The innocent party may waive his rights and continue the marriage which was not severed by the adultery of the other spouse. Before advising in these cases, the pastor should carefully weigh all circumstances, the family conditions, the nature of the offense, the character and temperament of both spouses, etc. If the innocent party is inclined to waive his right, he should, as a rule, be encouraged to do so. If, however, he voices strong objections, he should not be unduly urged, lest more harm than good be done by the advice of the pastor.

A. L. Graebner very correctly observes in the *Theological Quarterly*, IV, pp. 473 f.: "It is not the guilty party who obtains this right, and if the innocent party is willing to condone the offense and continue the state, the guilty party is morally bound to accept such condonation and continuation. The offer of the offended party to condone and to remain the espoused of the offender is not a new offer of marriage. If it were, the other party must be free to accept or reject such offer. What accrues to the innocent party, and to that party only, is the right of *ἀπολύειν*, of severing the bond of marriage,

of rescinding the state by putting an end to that whereby the state was established and sustained, the marriage consent. To use or to waive the exercise of this right rests with the party to whom the right itself has been granted by the Lawgiver. In the decision whether the state should continue, the guilty party is entirely at the mercy of the innocent party until the decision has been rendered, and this decision is final. If the injured party decide to condone and uphold the existing relation, both parties are and remain bound as they were before the offense. If the innocent party decide not to condone, but to rescind and thus to terminate the existing relation, both parties are free as they were before the relation was entered into and established. This final decision must be the free act of the party entitled to this remedy, and condonation brought about by duress or fraud is not condonation and leaves the case open for final decision. Of course, the innocent party cannot condone, or refuse to condone, before having obtained knowledge of the offense, and the burden of proof, when the charge is denied, rests with the offended party." Neither does the fact that A. has condoned one case of fornication while being ignorant of other cases committed either before or after the case condoned prohibit him from obtaining a divorce if these cases become known to him later and can be proved by him.

Self-evidently the convicted adulterer must be subjected to discipline, unless he is repentant and willing to ask the forgiveness of the wronged spouse and make public amends if, and to the extent that, the offense is publicly known.

TH. LAETSCH.

Dispositionen über die altkirchliche Epistelreihe.

Neujahr.

Gal. 3, 23—29.

Heute wünschen wir einander ein fröhliches und gesegnetes neues Jahr. Werden diese Segenswünsche in Erfüllung gehen?

Wie können wir dieses neue Jahr zu einem fröhlichen und gesegneten machen?

1. Dadurch, daß wir uns täglich durch das Gesetz zu Christo führen lassen;
2. dadurch, daß wir als Gottes Kinder wandeln;
3. dadurch, daß wir das verheißene ewige Erbe stets im Auge behalten.

1.

A. Nicht als solche, die unter dem Gesetz verwahrt und verschlossen sind, wie das Volk Gottes im Alten Bunde, B. 23—25. Wir sind nicht mehr im Kerker, nicht mehr unter dem Zuchtmeister, sondern frei, und

zwar durch das Kindlein zu Bethlehem, durch das der Glaube offenbart worden ist. Christus ist für uns unter das Gesetz getan worden, Gal. 4, 4 f.; Luf. 2, 21. Er hat es für uns erfüllt. Durch den Glauben an ihn sind wir nun freie Kinder Gottes. Als solche gehen wir fröhlich durch die Pforten des neuen Jahres.

B. Sondern als schwache Kinder Gottes, die allerdings noch fallen. Weil wir trotz unserer Gotteskindschaft das Gesetz noch fortwährend übertreten, muß das Gesetz doch noch unser Zuchtmeister auf Christum sein. Es muß uns unserer Sünde überführen und uns in die Arme unsers Heilandes treiben. Soll das neue Jahr ein rechtes Gnadenjahr sein, dann müssen wir täglich Buße tun. Wir müssen das Gesetz also mitnehmen auf unserer Reise durchs neue Jahr.

2.

A. Als Kinder Gottes ziehen wir ins neue Jahr. Laßt uns nun auch vorsichtiglich wandeln, nicht als die Unweisen, sondern als die Weisen; denn dann allein wird uns das Jahr Glück und Segen bringen: 1. Gott gegenüber, als seine lieben Kinder, B. 26; 2. der Welt gegenüber, als solche, die Christum angezogen haben, B. 27 (Chrysostomos: „Wenn man etwas angezogen hat, so erscheint man als das, was man trägt“); 3. unsern Mitchristen gegenüber, dadurch, daß wir die wahre Einigkeit, die Bruderliebe und den Frieden pflegen, B. 28.

B. Dann wird sich Gott stets als unser lieber Vater erweisen. Er wird uns leiten, beschirmen und segnen, Ps. 91.

3.

A. Als Kinder Gottes sind wir Erben der Verheißung, B. 29, ja sogar Miterben Christi und des ewigen Lebens, Röm. 8, 17. Alles, was im Evangelium verheißen wird, besonders aber der Himmel, ist unser Erbteil, 1 Petr. 1, 4 f.

B. Laßt uns dieses Erbe stets im Auge behalten; denn das ist unser Ziel. Wer kann im Hinblick darauf traurig und verzagt sein, selbst wenn es ihm im Irdischen schlecht geht?

Schluf. So können wir also dieses neue Jahr zu einem fröhlichen und gesegneten machen. (Zusammenfassung.) Lied 52, 5.

E. N. F.

Epiphanienfest.

Jes. 60, 1—6.

Die Weisen aus dem Morgenlande waren die Erstlinge aus der Heidentwelt, die zu Christo kamen. Welch reiche Ernte ist auf diese Erstlingsgarben gefolgt! Das ist ja der Hauptzweck der christlichen Kirche auf Erden, das Evangelium aller Welt zu predigen. Leider sind wir kalt und lässig in diesem Werk und bedürfen steter Aufmunterung.

„Mache dich auf, werde Licht!“

1. Weil der Herr so Großes an dir getan hat;
2. weil der Herr so Großes durch dich tun will.

1.

A. B. 1. 2. Man schildere die Finsternis, die noch immer die Völker bedeckt, gerade auch in den Ländern, in denen unsere Synode Mission treibt. Dann zeige man in berebten Worten die Herrlichkeit des Herrn, die über uns aufgegangen ist: reine Lehre und Erkenntnis: die köstlichsten himmlischen Güter, und zwar in reichster Fülle. Sollten wir da nicht uns aufmachen und andern leuchten?

B. Anstatt zu leuchten, saß Israel betrübt und verzagt am Boden. Die trüben Zeiten hatten ihr den Mut genommen, Jes. 51, 17—52, 2. Trotz all der herrlichen Verheißungen, Kap. 53—59, trotz der wiederholten Aufforderungen, sich aufzumachen, Kap. 52, 1; 54, 1. 2, saß sie noch immer im Staube. Doch der Herr verstieß sie nicht, sondern rief ihr noch einmal zu: B. 1. — So wird Gott nicht müde, uns aufzufordern, die wir so leicht ermüden im Werk der Mission. Wie waren wir in guten Zeiten so gleichgültig, und wie sind wir jetzt in schlechten Zeiten so nutzlos! Wir haben Verstoßung verdient. Der Herr verwirft uns aber nicht, sondern läßt uns aufs neue verkündigen: „Die Herrlichkeit des Herrn geht auf über dir“ und mahnt uns aufs neue: „Mache dich auf!“ Sollen solche reichen Gaben und eine so wohlgemeinte Mahnung umsonst sein? Gangen wir mit dem neuen Jahr endlich an, wirklich zu leuchten!

2.

A. B. 3—6. Unser Werk ist nicht umsonst. Man schildere den Erfolg, den wir durch Gottes Gnade in unserm Missionswerk aufzuweisen haben, und die Gelegenheit zu ähnlichen Erfolgen auf andern von uns noch unbebauten Gebieten.

B. Das will er durch dich und deine Gaben tun, B. 6. Kannst du dir eine bessere Verwendung deiner Gaben vorstellen? Wieviel Geld wird nicht zu sündlichen Zwecken gebraucht, wenigstens zu Zwecken, die keinen bleibenden Nutzen schaffen. Wieviel Geld, das wir vielleicht der Mission entzogen haben, ist verlorengegangen! Das Geld, das wir für Mission opfern, geht nicht verloren; das ist wohl angelegt, das schafft großen Nutzen, verhilft Sündern zur ewigen Seligkeit. Sollten wir da nicht zu großen Opfern bereit sein? Wenn nicht, dann frage dich allen Ernstes, ob du zu denen gehörst, die zu Christi Reich gebracht worden sind. Von diesen sagt der Herr, daß sie Gold und Weihrauch bringen, um des Herrn Lob zu verkündigen. Tun wir letzteres nicht, wie können wir uns dann des ersteren rühmen?

Darum auf zu neuem Eifer, zu neuer Willigkeit im Missionswerk, auch in diesem neuen Jahr!

E. L.

Erster Sonntag nach Epiphania.

Röm. 12, 1—6.

Es ist eigentümlich, wie klein doch der Mensch in Gottes Wort da steht. Wenn er in gewissem Sinne auch der Mittelpunkt ist, um den sich alles dreht, um dessentwillen Gott die Welt geschaffen, seinen Sohn gesandt hat, seinen Geist gibt, seine Bibel hat schreiben lassen, was hat doch der Mensch getan, damit dies alles zustande käme? Auch nicht das Geringste. Das sollte alle Selbstsucht und Selbsterhebung aus dem Herzen des Menschen nehmen. Nicht in Selbstsucht sollen wir leben, sondern allein die Ehre unsers Gottes und das Wohlergehen unsers Nächsten suchen.

Die Mahnung des Apostels zu rechter Selbstlosigkeit.

Er fordert uns auf

1. zur willigen Selbstaufopferung im Dienst Gottes;
2. zur demütigen Selbsteinschätzung im Dienst des Nächsten.

1.

Die Welt geht in Selbstsucht auf, meint, Gott schulde ihr ein gemächliches Leben auf dieser Erde; sie dankt ihm nicht, dient ihm nicht, und wenn sie sich der Rechtfchaffenheit befließigt, tut sie es aus Selbstsucht.

Dieser Welt stellt sich der Christ nicht gleich, R. 2. Eingedenk der großen Barmherzigkeit Gottes (vgl. Kap. 3—11), erneuert er seinen Sinn. Nicht mehr tut er wie die Welt, was ihm gefällt, wovon er sich Vorteil und Vergnügen verspricht. Er prüft vielmehr: R. 2b. Er gibt sich nicht zufrieden mit halben Maßregeln, sondern ruht nicht eher, als bis er den ganzen vollkommenen Gotteswillen erkannt hat. Hat er den erkannt, so macht er ihn zur Richtschnur seines ganzen Lebens — er verändert sich. In vernünftigem Gottesdienst, R. 1, bringt er seinen Leib zum Opfer dar. Das ist ein lebendiges Opfer; denn durch den Leib mit seinen Gliedern und Kräften betätigt sich die Seele in rührigem Gottesdienst. (Man zeige das an den Verrichtungen der einzelnen Glieder.) Das ist ein heiliges Opfer, 1 Kor. 6, 11. 15. Das ist ein Opfer, das nicht aus Lohnsucht gebracht wird, sondern aus Dankbarkeit gegen den, der gerade auch den Leib von der Schuld, Herrschaft und Strafe der Sünde erlöst hat. Ein solches Opfer gefällt Gott wohl. — Mahnung zu williger Darbringung dieses Opfers.

2.

Die Welt hält viel von sich selbst und will von jedermann bedient und geehrt werden. (Ausführen.) Ganz anders der Christ. Der Apostel mahnt R. 3 zu rechter Selbsteinschätzung. Als Kind des Jorns von Natur gleichwie auch die andern soll er mit dem Apostel bekennen: 1 Tim. 1, 15. 16. Solche Erkenntnis hält ihn in Demut, veranlaßt ihn aber auch, rühmend anzuerkennen, was Gott Großes an ihm getan hat.

Gerade auch in bezug auf seine Gaben hält der Christ das rechte Maß. Nicht unterschätzt er sie, auch wenn sie ihm nicht so begehrenswert erscheinen wie andere Gaben. Er wird aber auch nicht Verrichtungen sich anmaßen, zu denen er weder die nötige Begabung von Gott empfangen hat noch das rechte Maß des Glaubens, das heißt, die Zuerst, daß Gott gerade ihn zu diesem Werk bestimmt habe, v. 3. Noch weniger erhebt er sich über seinen Bruder, sondern als Glied am Leibe Christi stellt er seine Gaben in den Dienst des Mitchristen und damit der ganzen Gemeinde.

Das ist christliche Selbstlosigkeit, wenn man nicht sich selbst, sondern Gott und dem Nächsten dient. Zur Vollkommenheit darin wird es kein Mensch bringen; aber der, der gesagt hat: Matth. 20, 28, süht und deckt unsere Unvollkommenheit und gibt uns Kraft zur Nachfolge.

L. L.

Zweiter Sonntag nach Epiphania.

Röm. 12, 6—16.

Unsere Epistel ist die Fortsetzung der Iesontnäglichen, worin der Apostel zum Schluß gemahnt hatte, daß Christen als Glieder am Leibe Christi in rechter Liebe einander dienen sollten. Das führt er jetzt weiter aus.

Wir sind Glieder am Leibe Christi.

Darum sollen wir

1. einander dienen; 2. einander lieben.

1.

v. 7. 8. Man führe aus, wie die Christen als Glieder des Leibes Christi gerade in dem von Gott ihnen gegebenen Wirkungskreis und mit den von Gott ihnen verliehenen Gaben ihren Mitchristen und damit der ganzen Gemeinde dienen sollen. Einerlei ob einer ein besonderes Amt hat oder nicht, ob einer ein Prediger oder Lehrer oder Vorsteher oder Vater oder Mutter oder Hausherr oder Geschäftsmann oder Angestellter ist, einerlei ob man nun gerade in einem besonderen Beruf oder im allgemeinen Christenberuf tätig ist, immer und unter allen Umständen soll der Christ seine Gaben zum Besten des Nächsten gebrauchen. Das mag geschehen durch Lehre, Ermahnung usw., v. 7. 8. Das soll geschehen nicht um eitler Ehre willen, sondern in demütigem Dienst, der aus ungeheuchelter Liebe fließt.

2.

v. 9a gibt das Thema an für die folgende Ausführung. Der Apostel zeigt, wie ungeheuchelte Liebe sich in so mannigfacher Hinsicht erweist. Natürlich muß unsere Liebe vor allem echt sein, ihren Ursprung finden in der Liebe Gottes zu uns und sich aus dieser Liebe immer neue Kraft holen, so daß wir auch in unserer Liebe Gott immer ähnlicher werden. Sogleich im ersten Stück soll dies der Fall sein, daß wir das Böse verabscheuen und strafen und das Gute anerkennen und ihm bei-

fallen, einerlei wo es sich findet. Die Liebe kennt eben kein Ansehen der Person, sondern verbindet die Herzen der Christen in brüderlicher Gesinnung. Dabei ehrt einer den andern, wird auch nicht träge, wenn das Fleisch ermüden will, sondern läßt sich vom Geist Gottes mit neuer Liebesbrunst erfüllen. Dabei schickt man sich in die Zeit und trägt den besonderen Zeitumständen Rechnung, ohne sich jedoch von ihnen zur Sünde verleiten zu lassen. In trüben Zeiten erinnert sich der Christ seiner Hoffnung, 1 Petr. 1; er trägt dann geduldig die Trübsal und holt sich die dazu nötige Kraft durch anhaltendes Gebet, erweist sich auch durch sein rechtes Verhalten unter dem Kreuz als Beispiel für seine Mitchristen. Seine Liebe wird sich nicht nur der Heiligen annehmen, B. 13, sondern auch überfließen auf Fernerstehende, ja auf seine Feinde, B. 14. Besonders regen Anteil wird er an Freud' und Leid seiner Brüder, ob vornehm oder gering, nehmen, B. 15. 16.

Wie herrlich würde es in unsern Gemeinden stehen, wenn solche dienende Liebe alle Herzen miteinander verbände! Aufforderung zu aufrichtiger Selbstprüfung und Buße. L. R.

Dritter Sonntag nach Epiphania.

Röm. 12, 17—21.

Es gibt viel Hader und Streit in der Welt, leider auch unter uns Christen. Als Kinder Gottes sollen wir aber friedfertig sein.

Die Friedfertigkeit der Kinder Gottes.

1. Sie streben danach, den edlen Frieden zu bewahren.
2. Wenn Unfriede herrscht, suchen sie Frieden zu stiften.

1.

A. Sie versuchen, mit allen Menschen im Frieden zu leben, B. 18. Deshalb tun sie nichts, den Frieden zu stören.

B. Deshalb hüten sie sich 1. vor hoffärtigem Wesen, wodurch andere Menschen beleidigt und gereizt werden könnten, B. 17a; 2. sind anständig im Verkehr mit ihren Mitmenschen, sehen auf das, was gut und ehrbar ist, und suchen das Wohl des Nächsten zu fördern, B. 17c. So tun sie, was sie können, um den Frieden zu erhalten.

Gewissensfrage: Lust du dies?

2.

A. Der Apostel gibt zu, daß Christen zuweilen ohne ihre Schuld in einen Streit verwickelt werden können. B. 18: „Ist es möglich, soviel an euch ist.“ Ist das geschehen, dann tun sie alles, was in ihren Kräften steht, wieder Frieden zu stiften, B. 18.

B. Aber wie? 1. Sie vergelten nicht Böses mit Bösem, sondern überlassen die Rache dem Herrn, B. 17b. 19. Sie lassen sich also nicht vom Bösen überwinden, B. 21a. 2. Sie tun dem Feinde Gutes und ver-

suchen, ihn auf diese Weise wieder als Freund zu gewinnen, B. 20. Kurz, sie überwinden das Böse mit Gutem, B. 21b.

Gewissensfrage: Tröst du dies?

Schluß. Laßt uns bekennen, daß wir es in dieser Hinsicht oft verfehlt haben, darum um Vergebung bitten und mit Gottes Hilfe von nun an mit allem Eifer dem edlen Frieden nachjagen und ihn zu stiften, zu fördern und zu erhalten suchen. E. J. F.

Vierter Sonntag nach Epiphania.

Röm. 13, 8—10.

Das zwölfte Kapitel des Römerbriefs, aus dem die Episteln der drei ersten Sonntage nach Epiphania genommen sind, trägt die Überschrift „Christliche Lebensregeln“. Das paßt auch für das dreizehnte Kapitel, das eine lange Reihe von Anweisungen enthält, wie der Christ der Heiligung nachjagen soll, ohne welche niemand den Herrn sehen wird. Dann zieht der Apostel gleichsam einen Strich darunter und gibt uns in unserm Text die Summa an. Die vier Verse, die noch auf diesen Text folgen, enthalten nur noch eine Mahnung, warum wir es mit der Heiligung so ernst nehmen sollen. Welches ist nun diese Summa?

„So ist nun die Liebe des Gesetzes Erfüllung.“

1. Die Liebe ist die Quelle, woraus alle Gesetzeserfüllung hervorspringen muß.
2. Die Liebe ist die Summa, die das ganze Gesetz einschließt.

1.

Der Apostel redet von der Liebe zum Nächsten, also vornehmlich von der zweiten Tafel des Gesetzes. Er bezieht sich auf unser Verhalten gegen unsere Mitmenschen. Gott hat uns in diese Welt voller Menschen gesetzt, nicht daß wir uns von ihnen absondern sollen, sondern daß wir unter ihnen leben, mit ihnen verkehren sollen; mit allen Menschen, mit denen wir zusammentreffen, nicht nur mit einer bestimmten Klasse.

Was soll nun unser ganzes Verhalten gegen unsere Mitmenschen bestimmen? Gott hat uns sein Wort gegeben, das uns nie im Stich läßt, sondern uns für jede Lebenslage eine Maßregel gibt. Aber eins muß zuvor unser Herz erfüllen: die Liebe; davon müssen wir ausgehen. Nicht Feindschaft, die immer Böses wittert und Rache nimmt für jedes kleine Leid; nicht Selbstsucht, die immer nur das Ihre sucht und immer Nutzen aus dem Nächsten herauschlagen will; auch nicht Gleichgültigkeit, die sich gar nicht um den Nächsten kümmert, sondern Liebe.

Was heißt das? „Du sollst deinen Nächsten lieben als dich selbst.“ Genau dieselben Gefühle, die dich beseelen, genau dieselben Beweggründe, die dich leiten, wenn es sich um deine eigene Person handelt, sollen auch dein Verhalten gegen den Nächsten bestimmen. Das ist jedem unter uns leicht verständlich; keinem fehlt es an Selbstliebe; darum drückt der liebe Gott es so aus.

Der natürliche Mensch kennt solche Liebe nicht; es findet sich bei ihm zwar die natürliche Liebe zu Verwandten usw. Aber das ist nicht die Liebe, von der hier die Rede ist. Was die Welt Liebe nennt, beschreibt der Herr Luth. 6, 32—35. (Lied 247, 3.) Die wahre Liebe muß Gott ins Herz pflanzen, 1 Joh. 4, 7; sie ist eine Frucht des Glaubens, den der Heilige Geist durchs Evangelium wirkt. Nur ein Herz, das Gottes große Liebe erkannt hat und ihn dafür wieder liebt, kann dann auch den Nächsten lieben. So gehört auch die erste Tafel des Gesetzes in diesen Text hinein, und Luther hat recht, wenn er die Erklärung jedes Gebotes mit den Worten beginnt: „Wir sollen Gott fürchten und lieben.“

Nur was so aus der Liebe fließt, ist des Gesetzes Erfüllung; alles andere hat keinen Wert. Aber alles, was aus der Liebe fließt, ist Gesetzeserfüllung und Gott gefällig. Das wird uns klar werden, wenn wir nun zum andern betrachten, daß die Liebe die Summa ist, die das ganze Gesetz einschließt.

2.

Der Apostel führt Beispiele an: das sechste, fünfte, siebte, achte, neunte Gebot. Wer den Nächsten liebt, dem wird auch das Familienleben, das Leben, das Vermögen, der gute Name des Nächsten heilig sein, so heilig, daß er nicht einmal in Gedanken sich daran versündigt.

Ja, erst im Licht der Liebe wird uns das rechte Verständnis der einzelnen Gebote aufgehen. Im Licht der Liebe erklärt der Herr selber das Gesetz in der Bergpredigt. Die Liebe zeigt, daß das fünfte Gebot auch durch bloße Schädigung des leiblichen Wohls unsers Nächsten, Röm. 12, 19, durch Beleidigung, Matth. 5, 22, ja durch Gedanken des Herzens, Zorn, Haß, Unversöhnlichkeit, Matth. 5, 22; 1 Joh. 3, 15; Matth. 5, 23—26, übertreten wird; das sechste Gebot usw. (man erinnere sich kurz die angeführten Gebote nach dem Katechismus). Ja, die Liebe zeigt, daß jedes dieser Gebote ein Gebot in sich schließt. (Erklärung, wieder nach dem Katechismus.)

Das Gesetz fordert also im Grunde nichts anderes als Liebe. Aber das Gesetz fordert wirklich Liebe; darum ist die Liebe eine Schuld, die Gott von uns fordert; eine bleibende Schuld, teils weil sie uns bis an unser Ende verpflichtet, teils weil unsere Bezahlung dieser Schuld so unvollkommen ist. Doch sollen wir fleißig daran abzahlen, aber nicht um uns etwas dadurch zu verdienen (durch Bezahlung seiner Schulden verdient man keinen Lohn), sondern weil es Gottes Wille ist und weil unsere Liebe zu Gott uns dazu bringt.

Prüfen wir uns! Erfüllt sich nicht auch an Christen Matth. 24, 12? Erhaltung der Liebe zum Nächsten zeigt aber zugleich Erhaltung der Liebe zu Gott an, und die bringt mit sich große Gefahr für den Glauben.

Lassen wir uns aber dadurch ermuntern, daß Gott auch unsere unvollkommenen Werke in Gnaden ansehen und annehmen will und uns noch obendrein einen herrlichen Gnadenlohn dafür verheißen hat, Luth. 6, 23; Matth. 10, 42.

E. G.

Miscellanea.

Christian Ethics.

In an older church-body, like in an older congregation, there is always danger that the presentation of the orthodox doctrine will be accompanied by a strong strain of legalism in the field of ethics and that rules and laws, often rather arbitrarily motivated, will be employed instead of evangelical persuasion. On the other hand, certain tendencies may manifest themselves which tend to make Christian liberty a cloak of maliciousness and to speak of adiaphora where the matters concerned are far from the field of things indifferent. It should never be necessary for a pastor to swing the "big stick," but it is necessary that he adhere closely to the ethics of the Bible. To yield weakly on some point when the contention is made that there is no specific prohibition in Scripture means to subvert clear ethical thinking. For a Christian to make it a habit to look for commands and prohibitions in the Bible is for him to leave the status of a child and to return to that of a slave. The Bible is full of ethical precepts and hints, and while the Lord does not offer all of them in the form of specific commands to His children, it will be best for these children to inquire, What will please my heavenly Father and my Savior best? How can I best show my appreciation of His grace, mercy, and goodness towards me? It is then, and only then, that a pastor will properly advise his parishioners and our Christians will receive proper guidance. P. E. K.

By-Products of a Discussion on Christian Art.

In Gardner's *Principles of Christian Art* the following interesting paragraphs are found: "In the last century, in Western Europe and America, the even course of life, the enormous increase of the means of enjoyment, tended to put asceticism out of court. But now a tremendous reaction is beginning to set in. The universal horrors of the Great War, the frightful condition into which Russia has fallen, the excessive growth of the spirit of nationality, also the abuse of wealth and the rebellion of poverty throughout Europe and America, have caused in all who reflect, all who have leisure to consider what is taking place, a certain degree of pessimism. It can hardly be doubted that asceticism will revive."—"I do not believe that Dr. Dearmer's way of looking at the externals of worship will commend itself to English Christians generally. It may be regarded as parallel to the love of smart clothing and the pursuit of fashion in ordinary life. It is far more attractive to women and feminine-minded clerics than to men. And there is much truth in the view of Amiel that a state, a society, or a church which effeminizes itself is on the way to degeneracy and decay. Even in the Middle Ages, though splendid ceremonies and spectacles were provided by the hierarchy to attract the people in the street, the life-blood of the Church poured in other directions, towards the life of austerities in the cloister and careful thinking in the universities. And at present, however it may be with the Latin races, the Teutonic people have long ago made up their minds as to the indifferent character of mere outward show and ceremony."—"One feels par-

alyzed when one tries to speak of beauty to a woman who thinks short masculine hair more pleasing than the lovely arrangements of past days. No doubt in many periods the hair of women has been arranged in too stiff and formal a manner; but to do away with it altogether is an abandonment of all poetry and idealism. . . . More obviously contrary to nature and to beauty is the custom of doing away with the long hair, which has been the theme of poets since poetry began and which may be so treated as greatly to enhance the beauty of a woman, especially if the hair be fair. I sometimes fancy that the next move of fashion may be to shave the head entirely and to wear a wig, perhaps of green or purple color."

P. E. K.

A "Graded" Catholic Catechism.

In his review of Gasparri's *Catholic Catechism*, in the authorized English translation by the Rev. Hugh Pope, Mr. Hugh P. Ryan remarks: "The *Catholic Catechism* is made up of three parts: a preparatory catechism for children who have not made their first communion, a larger catechism for older children, and a catechism for advanced pupils. In almost every case the questions and answers are stated in a language easily understood by the children for whom they are intended." Since the Roman Catholics have not only remained abreast of the times in their training of children, but have consistently forged ahead in using the most approved methods, this notice is of particular interest. It seems that our Synod did not make a false move in advocating a catechism to be graded in three steps.

P. E. K.

The Meaning of a Well-Known Slogan.

In a book by Professor Eckhof published at Leiden in 1931 he discusses one of the favorite slogans of our day: "In essentials unity, in non-essentials liberty, in all things charity," and shows that the phrase really should read: *In necessariis unitas, in non-necessariis libertas, in utrisque caritas*, which he translates: "Unity in things necessary to salvation, liberty in those not necessary to salvation, charity in both."

P. E. K.

Noch einmal Gustav Adolf.

Man liebt es katholischerseits, Gustav Adolf den „Vertilger Deutschlands“ zu nennen, „über das er und seine Horden unsägliches Unglück gebracht haben“. Man zitiert gerne den „Schwedentrunk“, daß Mütter ihren unartigen Kindern drohten: „Der Schwede kommt!“ Es ist wahr, daß nach des Königs Tode das schwedische Heer immer mehr verwilderte und schließlich ebenso verkommen war und ebenso ruchlos und gewalttätig handelte wie die Kaiserlichen. Aber es ist nicht recht, Gustav Adolf dafür verantwortlich zu halten. Auch kann man das Heer nach 1632 kaum mehr mit Recht ein schwedisches nennen. Gleich nach dem ersten größeren Siege des Schwedenkönigs strömten ihm Soldaten aus aller Herren Ländern zu; am Tage nach der Breitenfelder Schlacht soll er bereits 5,000 Krieger mehr gehabt haben, als er am vorigen Tage in die Schlacht geführt hatte; Ende 1631 befehligte er über 100,000 Mann. Zur Zeit seines Todes bestand das Heer zu vier Fünfteln aus in Deutschland angeworbenen Truppen. Diese aber hatten schon eine ganz andere Schule durchgemacht; sie hatten zum großen Teil bei Tilly und Wallenstein gelernt. So litt bald

die Disziplin im Schwedenheer, und schon der große König fand es schwer, seine Soldaten in Zucht zu halten.

Das „Kirchenblatt“ bringt die Abschrift einer alten Handschrift aus den Wertheimischen Archiven vom 3. Juli 1632, aus der hervorgeht, wie der König unablässig bemüht war, die verwilderten Soldaten im Zaume zu halten. Ein Amtmann aus Wertheim hatte Beschwerde gebracht über Plünderungen von seiten schwedischer Soldaten; ihm wurde der Bescheid, „diese Tathlichkeiten sollten dermaßen abgestraft werden, daß sich noch mancher Offizier hinterm Ohr kraken werde“. Und dann folgt eine „Lehrhafte Predigt“ in Abschrift aus einem „Diskurs“, den der König in Nürnberg gehalten hatte, „daß vielen vornehmen Obristen und Offizieren die Augen übergegangen“. Etliches daraus mag den Lesern interessant sein:

„Ihr Fürsten, Grafen und Herren, Ihr Generalobristen, Obristen, Leutnant! Ihr seid eben diejenigen, die Eurem Vaterland Untreu' beweisen und deßhalb ruinieren helfen. . . . Wenn ich ißt Euch ansehe und bedenke Euer Stehlen, Rauben und Plündern, und daß Ihr mit unter der Deck' lieget und partizipieret, kein Disziplin oder iustitiam haltet, so stehen mir alle Haare zu Berg. Ist das nicht Gott zu erbarmen, daß ein Christ und Religionsverwandter, ein Freund, ein Schwager, ja wohl ein Bruder den anderen ausplündert und verderbet? Die Teuffel in der Hellen beweisen einander mehr Treu' und Lieb' als die Christen unter sich selbst. Das Herz im Leib möcht' mir zerspringen, wenn ich höre, das Schwedisch Volk hause ärger als der Feind, da doch nicht das Schwedische, sondern das Teutsche Volk es tut. Hätte ich gewußt, daß Ihr solchen Humors und Eurem Vaterland nicht besser dienet und mehr Treu' und Lieb' erweisen wollet, ich hätte nicht lassen ein Pferd Eurethalben satteln oder Euch zum Besten meinen königlichen Leib und so vieler tapferer Helden neben mir in die Gefahr gewagt, sondern ich wollte Euch, weiln Ihr ja Lust darzu, in die größte Sklaverei und servitutum steden lassen. . . .

„Gedenket Ihr nicht, . . . was für schwer Gewissen und Strafen Gottes Ihr uff Euch und Eure Nachkommen ladet und uff das ganze Land ziehet und was Rechenchaft Ihr am Jüngsten Tag dafür geben müßet? Ich wollte lieber in meinem Königreich der Säu' hütten als solchem Untwesen länger zusehen, da ich Gottes Born und Nach' uff mich bringen würde. . . .

„Was habe ich davon? Nichts! Ich bezeuge es vor Gott und ist die Wahrheit, daß ich nicht von diesem Kriege habe, daß ich mir ein Paar Hosen machen lassen könnte. Wollt' auch lieber ohne Hosen reiten als mit der armen Leut' Schaden mich bereichern. Ich will einem jeden, der es begehrt, vorlegen, daß ich über vierzig Tonnen Goldes aus meinem Königreich meinen Religionsverwandten und Euch zum Besten in zweieunddreißig Wechßeln herausmachen lassen und spendiert. Aber das wollte ich geschweigen, wenn ich nicht so viel guter Leute darüber verloren hätte.“

Dann habe er die Warnung getan, daß er keinen schonen wolle; „begehrt sie aber zu meutneren, so wolle er's mit seinen Schweden und Dienern mit ihnen annehmen und sich mit ihnen herumschmeißen, daß die Stück' dabonspringen sollten“. Stracks darnach habe er einen Leutnant hängen lassen und bekannt gemacht, daß er nicht die Soldaten, sondern die Offiziere an Leib und Leben strafen werde. „Und als ein Bauer vor den König gelaufen und geklagt, daß ihm sei eine Kuh genommen worden, ist Ihre königliche Majestät mit ihm . . . auf ihn [den Kapitän-Leutnant]

straßs zugeritten, ihn bei den Haaren erwischt und mit sich also zum Pro-
fossen geführt, der solle . . . auch hingerichtet werden, . . . dabei sonderlich
zu notieren, daß Ihre Majestät den Kapitän-Leutnant, indem er ihn beim
Kopf erwischt, gar glimpflich angerebet: Komm her, mein Sohn, es ist
besser, ich strafe dich, denn daß Unser Herrgott mich, dich und uns alle
strafe.“ L. S.

Late Archeological News from Palestine.

Further work has been done on the site of Mizpah, the fortress that
existed from the time of King Asa of Judah until its capture by the
Assyrians. One of the achievements in this connection was the complete
excavation of the temple of the "queen of heaven," Jer. 44, 17—19, whose
licentious worship was so strongly denounced by the prophets. It is the
first time in the history of Palestinian archeology that an ancient city
gate has been found so well preserved. — The same number of the *Amer-
ican Journal of Archeology* also discusses some late work at Shechem,
where a city "walled up to heaven" was discovered, a gigantic cyclopean
wall with a rectangular tower-gate having four corner towers. The wall
of the lower city is a complex of two parallel walls, with 35 feet between.
It is 65 feet high and 50 feet thick. The walls can be traced in an un-
broken circuit, indicating a city of about 15 acres. These walls are
Hittite, begun in the fourteenth century B. C., and existed till 1100 B. C.
At the foot of Mount Gerizim Dr. Welter also discovered a temple of Baal-
berith dating from the late Bronze Age (1400—1300 B. C.), with Canaanite
cult objects, including a unique fetish stone. Shechem was first built
between 1479 and 1447 B. C. by the conqueror Labaya, mentioned in the
Tel-el-Amarna letters. P. E. K.

Befehrung der Franken.

Auf einen Bericht Gregors von Tours stützt sich die bekannte Geschichte
von Klodwigs Befehrung und Taufe samt 3,000 seiner Franken. In der
Nemmannenschlacht, 496, so berichtet Gregor, flehte Klodwig (oder Chlodo-
wech) zu dem Christengott, den er durch seine Gattin kannte, und gelobte,
sich zum Christentum zu bekennen, wenn er den Sieg gewönne. Er siegte,
ließ sich mit seinen Franken zu Weihnachten desselben Jahres von Bischof
Remigius von Reims taufen, wobei dieser die Worte sprach: „Beuge sanft
deinen Nacken, Sigamber, bete an, was du angezündet hast, zünde an, was
du angebetet hast!“ In „Forschungen und Fortschritte“ unterbreitet D. Bruno
Krusch seine neuen Untersuchungen über Gregor. Aus einem Briefe des
Bischofs Avitus von Vienne an den Frankenkönig, in dem er ihm mitteilt,
daß er der Einladung zu seiner Taufe nicht Folge leisten könne, geht her-
vor, daß Klodwig von Arianern umgeben war und wohl selber zum Arian-
ismus hinneigte; er wählte aber den Katholizismus. Darob drückt Avi-
tus seine große Freude aus. Aus einem Briefe des Bischofs Nicetus von
Trier an eine Enkelin Klodwigs ist ersichtlich, daß der 11. November der
Taufstag Klodwigs war; und weil als Ort der Taufe die Kirche domini
Martini genannt wird, schließt Krusch, dies sei die Martinskirche zu Tours,
das Taufjahr Klodwigs daher nach der Eroberung von Tours, also nach
dem Westgotenkriege, 507, anzusetzen. Damit fiele dann die ganze schöne
Geschichte, die wir so oft zitiert haben, als eine bloße Erfindung Gregors
hin. Schadel L. S.

Theological Observer. — *Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches.*

I. Amerika.

The Difference between Lutherans and Fundamentalists. — In the *Lutheran* of October 27, 1932, Dr. John A. W. Haas, president of Muhlenberg College, contributes an editorial which is important enough to be reproduced here and to receive a few comments. Dr. Haas speaks of the position of the Lutheran Church with respect to Modernism and Fundamentalism as these terms are commonly used to-day.

"In a group of people the question was raised as to where the Lutheran Church stood as over against the two prevalent tendencies of Modernism and Fundamentalism in present American Christianity. All were agreed that almost without exception there was no Modernism in Lutheran pulpits and theological seminaries. But many thought that American Lutheranism was fundamentalistic. The latter idea is as wrong as the conception of the attitude of the Lutheran Church toward Modernism is correct. Perhaps it will be of value to some readers of the *Lutheran* to have the relation of sound Lutheranism toward these two tendencies and positions briefly stated.

"The God of the Modernists is conceived from the angle of the scientists' infinite universe. Lutherans find God as the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

"Modernists have no real faith in God's direct providence; but Lutheranism still accepts the words of Christ that not a sparrow falleth to the ground without the Father's will and that the hairs of our heads are numbered.

"Modernism has no real divine Christ, but only a great human teacher, while the Lutheran Church holds to the faith in the Son of God and in the Son of Man, Savior and Redeemer.

"The Modernists do not believe in a real incarnation and therefore deny the Virgin Birth. Lutheranism accepts both as revealed truth.

"Modernism sidesteps the fact of sin and its inheritance in the human race; but the Lutheran Church takes the fact and doctrine about sin as an undeniable reality.

"The Modernists reject all belief in the actual, visible return of Christ, while Lutheranism accepts it as a great hope.

"In short, Modernism is rationalistic and corrects the emaciated Bible which it uses by modern scientific hypotheses and modern philosophic speculations. In part it revamps old rationalism. The Lutheran Church rests its faith simply and solely on the Word and then uses what is usable of modern thought in its theology.

"In many doctrines the Lutheran Church agrees with present-day Fundamentalism, but it detects constantly that the orthodoxy of Fundamentalism has a Reformed Church tendency and character. Therefore, —

"Fundamentalism stresses the Bible too much as a written and printed book, and it is very book-conscious. The Lutheran Church values the Bible as the purveyor of the Word. For her the living Word makes the Bible, and the Bible is the revelation of the Word.

"The Fundamentalists have a mechanical, literalistic theory of inspiration, after the manner of the early Reformed confessions. Lutheranism believes in the inspiration of the Word and that holy men of God were guided by the Spirit, so that the inspiration reaches the words of the Bible, but not in a mechanical manner.

"Fundamentalism not only accepts the infallibility of the Bible, but it implies the infallibility of the Fundamentalist interpretation. Lutheranism only claims that it has the pure doctrine, but it ascribes infallibility to the Word alone.

"Like all group Christianity in the Church, Fundamentalism carries with it the expressed or implied idea that its adherents are the really elect of God. It possesses a tinge of old Calvinism. Lutheranism is opposed to all kinds of conventicular Christianity of whatever form, and it glorifies the living and invisible Church of Christ.

"Fundamentalism, with all its claim of having the whole Bible, neglects the clear confession of Baptism as bestowing forgiveness of sins and of the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Communion. It is Reformed in these articles of faith, which are so precious to the Lutheran Church.

"Finally, the Fundamentalists believe that Christ will reign a thousand years on earth before the end of time, and they have many peculiar interpretations and diagrams to explain the revelation of St. John. From the beginning of its history the Lutheran Church has rejected all such doctrines as fantastic. While it accepts all prophecy, it conceives of the kingdom of God in a spiritual manner. The Fundamentalists, who make the people believe that they know all about the future, do not really strengthen hope, and they do not leave to God's wisdom and counsel the great hereafter."

Most of what Dr. Haas says receives our ready approval. In speaking of the Modernists, he has not been inaccurate or uncharitable. What they teach destroys the very foundations of Christianity. When we come to his description of the Fundamentalists, however, we are constrained to ask whether he has stated correctly the difference between Lutherans and Fundamentalists as to the Bible. We are not sure that we understand what he means when he states: "Fundamentalism stresses the Bible too much as a written and printed book, and it is very book-conscious." If he has in mind that Fundamentalists coming from, or belonging to, the Reformed camp look upon the Scriptures as a legal codex, consisting of a given number of paragraphs, which can be quoted and used in a mechanical manner, we agree. Again, if he has in mind the Reformed tendency to overlook the difference between Biblical books universally accepted in the ancient Church and such as were not universally accepted, we agree. Furthermore, if he wishes to say that Fundamentalists ignore the distinction between the Old Testament and the New Testament and in this respect differ from the Lutheran Church, he again has our endorsement. But if his words are to imply that Lutherans teach not every part of the Scriptures is divine, we have to disagree. We have to state as our conviction that, when Lutherans say certain sections of the Bible are not so important as others, that is not the same as saying certain sections of the Bible are not inspired in the same degree as others.

In his criticism of the mechanical, literalistic theory of inspiration held probably by some Fundamentalists we join Dr. Haas. When he says: "Fundamentalism not only accepts the infallibility of the Bible, but it implies the infallibility of the Fundamentalist interpretation," he is raising a charge which, we believe, it will be difficult for him to prove. We are at a loss to see what Dr. Haas means when he says: "Like all group Christianity in the Church, Fundamentalism carries with it the expressed or implied idea that its adherents are the really elect of God." What does the expression "group Christianity in the Church" refer to? Does Dr. Haas wish to deny that Christians of the same faith should join each other in carrying on the work which Christ has given His believers to do? Group Christianity certainly has the sanction of the New Testament. Cf. Matt. 18, 15—20. When Dr. Haas is objecting to conventicular Christianity, we, of course, agree with him; but we hold that not every form of group Christianity belongs to the class of conventicular Christianity. We wish that the editorial quoted above—good as it is—would have been more explicit in the points alluded to. A.

Frightful Misrepresentation. — In discussing the question why Protestant churches with Modernistic leanings are a failure, a writer in the *Congregationalist and Herald of Gospel Liberty* has this to say: "A business man once gave me his explanation of the loyalty of Roman Catholics to their Church. He said: 'If our local physician should announce that on Monday morning at a given hour he would be in an appointed place to dispense a remedy that he would guarantee would put us in perfect physical trim for the rest of the week, we would all be there to get our little pill.' The application is obvious. In the Protestant wing of Christianity there is still a group which draws a large following both in city and country, and many of their preachers are men of no more than average ability. These men preach a Gospel that promises to those who subscribe to a form of words an eternal happiness in a future world. . . . Our modern liberal Protestant churches preach a gospel of brotherhood, a gospel of self-sacrifice and service for the uplift and welfare of the human race. As a result our churches are deserted for the golf-course on Sunday mornings." Evidently the writer is aiming a shaft at the churches which still adhere to the Bible in all its teachings. But where will you find a church which preaches a message promising to those who subscribe to a form of words an eternal happiness in the future world? Such churches are a figment of his own imagination. The writer seems to proceed on the old, but iniquitous adage that everything is fair in love and war. As to conditions in Modernistic churches, it is pathetic to hear the writer's confession of bankruptcy. A.

The Race Problem in the Episcopal Church. — The Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States has a race problem on its hands. In May, 1932, at a regular convention, Rev. Williamson of Little Rock was elected Bishop of Arkansas. The ratification by the standing committees of the diocese took place as prescribed in the canons of the Church. One thing remains: confirmation by the House of Bishops. Before this venerable body could act, a storm broke. It is alleged that at the convention referred to the Negro members of the clergy were asked to hold a separate

Communion service, which request deeply offended them and now has led to protests against the confirmation of the election held at that convention. Many other factors enter in, such as the prevailing depression, which would seem to indicate that the number of bishops should not be augmented unnecessarily. That a very delicate problem is here presenting itself to the Episcopal authorities for adjustment will be readily admitted by all who have first-hand knowledge of racial feeling south of Mason and Dixon's line. We are alluding to it, not only to register anew our disapproval of the yoke which Episcopal (and Anglican) church polity is placing on the necks of the Christians belonging to this communion, but chiefly to draw the attention of the brethren to the difficulties connected with church-work among the colored people in our country, difficulties which demand prayerful and sympathetic study. A.

The Swing toward Ritualism in the Congregational Church. —

In an article entitled "The Recovery of Power," written by Herbert J. Hinman and published in the *Congregationalist*, the writer strongly advocates ritualistic services. The editor of the paper states that he does not agree with the article, but that he was printing it "because of the sincerity and significance of its challenge." We Lutherans may learn from this that Luther and his coworkers, when they proceeded in conservative fashion as they were reforming the Church, took a wise course in avoiding both the extreme of ultraritualism and that of the barren service, which lacks all emotional appeal. Rev. Hinman says in part: —

"Protestantism, and especially Congregationalism, began by exalting the sermon and at first almost entirely neglected the appeal to the eye. In consequence it has continually slumped into a dry and barren intellectualism. From time to time it has been saved by the emotionalism of the revival, but it has continually slipped back into its old ways. The liturgical churches have not felt the necessity of periodic revivals because they make a continuous appeal to human emotion through their ceremonies. At the present time the revival is distinctly in the discard. Most denominations have given it up, and where it is still used, the results are less and less conspicuous. But the need of emotion in religion is as great as ever. We may lecture men on the necessity of personal and social righteousness until we are exhausted. They will agree with everything we say — and then go on in the same old way. Few men have ever been converted by an appeal to reason. The Church must stir their hearts in order to get results. This truth is gradually penetrating the consciousness of our pastors, and they are turning more and more to the emotional appeal of beauty and liturgy. In place of the severely simple meeting-house of Puritan days we have beautiful and impressive churches in all our cities. In place of the two-hour sermon and the scanty service of that period we have processions, crosses, vestments, liturgies, and a sermon that lasts about twenty-five minutes. The Church has learned at last the true source of power, which is 'ceremony, appealing to the eye, and stirring the emotions of men.' If all our churches adopt this method, they will in the course of time recover the power of days gone by and will be able to speak with authority on the great questions of our day. The attempt to lecture men who will not listen is the height of folly. But when the Church has gained their attention, it can again say, 'Thus saith the Lord.'"

We, of course, entirely disagree with the writer when he speaks of ceremony as the true source of power, but his words may well remind us of the preciousness of our Lutheran liturgical heritage. A.

A Practical Application of the Papal Marriage Laws. — It may be that some Protestants are not taking the pronouncements of the Pope, when he declares marriages null and void if they are not performed according to his rules, very seriously. Let them read this excerpt from the article of a Scotch correspondent in the *Christian Century* for August 31: "It was a case of a Protestant husband and a Roman Catholic wife, who had agreed to be married by a Protestant minister and were so married in Lenwood Parish Church. Their married felicity was unbroken till the arrival of a son in December, 1927. Thereupon there descended upon the wife certain relatives, who immediately raised the question of the particular communion into which this new being should be introduced. Lord Mackay (the judge) regarded it as of the most serious importance that such an interference should have been allowed to come between a happily married couple. One day in February, when the family had been there, in the afternoon, the husband kissed the defendant (in the divorce suit) good-by on going to work. At tea time he found the house deserted, his wife and child gone, and a note, saying, 'Dear Jim, I have gone for good.' The husband went to her parents' house. The father came to the doorstep, the defendant being somewhere behind, and the father (not the wife) said they were required to be married in the Roman Catholic church. That was the first suggestion of any so-called religious difficulty at all. The plaintiff's reply was that they were already married and that he did not desire any priest to govern his house." As indicated above, this led to a suit for divorce on the ground of malicious desertion, and the judge granted the divorce, with severe castigation of the Roman Catholic marriage laws which led to this disruption of the family. A.

A Testimony against the Lodge. — We note with pleasure that the *Theological Forum*, published by the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America, in its July issue submits a sermon by R. A. Ofstedal, entitled "The Lodge—a Call to Worldliness." The sermon constitutes an able pamphlet against the menace of lodgery. There are paragraphs of great power in this discourse. Of the duty of the pastor to speak out on the subject the author says: "Then, again, some may be led to think, 'How is it that the pastor has such a dislike for us lodge-members since he so often speaks about our fraternal affiliations?' And I will answer that question by asking another, 'What do you expect of your watch-dog when danger approaches?' You expect him to bark. If he does not warn you, he is of no value to you. Now, you would surely expect as much of your pastor as you do of your dog, as much of watchfulness, of loyalty, of faithfulness. Do you know that your Bible speaks of pastors that see danger approaching and neglect to warn as 'dumb dogs that cannot bark'? By God's grace I would be the kind of pastor that warns, having that noble example of the Apostle Paul to look to when he said to the elders at Ephesus: 'Remember that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears.' In thus caring for your souls, I feel that I can best show my friendship for you lodge-members as well as for others to whom I minister. And if any of those committed to my care

are lost, I do not want them to be saying in all eternity, 'If my pastor had been faithful in warning me, I should not be here.'" The author shows very clearly that Masonry and Christianity are incompatible. May this testimony throughout the Lutheran Church receive the attention which it merits!

A.

Subsidizing Our Colleges. — The Catholic weekly *America* recently had the following editorial: —

"The financial depression of the last few years has brought some of our colleges to the brink of ruin. A few, the most notable being St. Mary's College in Kansas, have closed their doors after a futile struggle. Others, we are informed, will reach their crisis by the end of the present year. It would be hard to exaggerate the gravity of the situation which confronts Catholic higher education in this country. — No Catholic college in the United States has an adequate endowment. Only a few have any endowment whatever. Practically all must depend upon tuition-fees and the income from chance gifts and bequests. Twenty-five years ago, when of every ten teachers at least nine were religious, it was possible by the exercise of severe economy to balance the budget. But since the beginning of the century this proportion of one to ten has changed, so that to-day it is more nearly four and one half to five and one half. This change means, of course, a salary list which is greater by at least 450 per cent. In all probability the disproportion is even larger. — In addition to this burden the colleges must assume responsibilities unknown a generation ago. Catholic institutions have been compelled by various standardizing agencies to add to their courses and equipment, not because they deemed these additions in all cases an improvement, but because otherwise their certificates and degrees would be useless to their graduates. A united stand by all Catholic schools might have been effective as recently as 1900, but it is now too late to cry over spilled milk. At present, and as far as can be foreseen, the rule of the standardizing agencies, private and State, will control for many years, although in course of time it will probably be exercised with better judgment. — The Catholic college of to-day, then, has reached the limits of its scanty financial resources. Unless aid comes, and comes quickly, the only institutions of higher education in this country which owe any allegiance whatever to God and His Law may be compelled to discontinue their work for Church and State. — From what source is this aid to be obtained? Up to the present practically all our colleges and high schools have been administered by members of religious orders. Within the last generation, however, the diocesan college and the central high school, both direct charges upon the diocese, have made their appearance. As a rule, tuition-fees have been charged, and the deficit has been made up by the diocesan authorities. The religious orders, however, have been left to their own resources, and generally they have managed to hold their own. As these resources have now all but disappeared, it has been suggested that the colleges controlled by the various religious orders be also made the beneficiaries of diocesan funds. — In an interesting paper read at the Cincinnati convention of the National Catholic Educational Association, the Rev. J. W. R. Maguire, S. C. V., president of St. Viator's College, said that, while parish-schools, central and district high schools, charities, and other works of the Church have access to this

revenue, 'the college alone stands apart, shackled and in want, yet striving bravely to do the important and essential work of the church-teaching.' For generations the dioceses have been engaged in other, more necessary work. Much of it has been completed successfully. Can they now turn their attention to the Catholic college? — Father Maguire writes that the problem would be settled were every Catholic in the United States to make an annual contribution of one dollar. Added to our present resources in tuition-fees, 'twenty million dollars a year will adequately furnish college education for 60,000 to 100,000 students' in the colleges on the accredited list of the National Catholic Educational Association. These dollars would be gathered under diocesan authority and prorated to the colleges. — The acceptance or rejection of this plan lies wholly within the province of the Hierarchy. It would ill become us to pronounce any judgment on Father Maguire's suggestion, save to say that we believe it worthy of serious consideration."

P. E. K.

Will Lutherans Unite? — In the *Lutheran Companion* of September 17 we find an editorial with the heading "A United American Lutheran Church," the last section of which we desire to reprint here. After some remarks pertaining to the symposium which recently appeared in the *Augustana Quarterly* on the question of the union of Lutherans in America, the editor says: —

"If it were possible for all Lutherans in America to form an external union of their forces and work together as Lutherans, the thing can be done. But is this possible? We are not able to free ourselves from the suspicion that some of the advocates of union imagine that the component parts of the American Lutheran Church must retain their entity and then continue their separate work. The United Lutheran Church, the American Lutheran Church, the Augustana Synod, the Norwegian Lutheran Church, and the Synodical Conference shall flow side by side as separate streams as before. Or is not this the thought of at least one of the writers in the symposium? It was this idea that prevented the Augustana Synod from joining with other synods in the formation of the United Lutheran Church in America in 1917. If one synod should become an independent part of the new body, the union would not be organic. In the reorganized Lutheran Church in America there can be no room for American, German, Norwegian, and Swedish. Lutheran must be the uniting word; all other appellations are divisive. Are the Lutherans ready for such a move? Has the American melting-pot done its work so completely? We are united in faith and spirit, yes, but we are still human and have our own convictions as to the proper methods to pursue the work of the Church. Probably as far as we can get at present, is to hold conventions for discussing questions of differences, as Dr. Maier suggests. All assertions to the contrary that we are agreed on doctrine, there are still shades of difference as to what constitutes true Lutheranism."

While the first part of the paragraph does not touch the real difficulty, the last sentences should by all means be heeded. We hold these points to be axiomatic: 1. Unity in doctrine, so that the divine Gospel and the holy Sacraments will be kept and handed down unimpaired, must be the chief aim. 2. While true unity is something every one of us should devoutly pray for, the matter of outward union is relatively unimportant.

3. A practicable form of external union will easily suggest itself after inward unity has been established and is manifesting itself. 4. Earnest, prayerful study of the Holy Scriptures and the Confessions of the Church, to be supplemented by the writings of Luther and the other great leaders of our Church, together with mutual discussions carried on in the spirit of Christian charity, will have to bring about the desired result. A.

The Only Foundation. — Dr. Pfatteicher, president of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania, in his annual report to his church-body at Lancaster, Pennsylvania, last June, said among other things (we are quoting from the *Kirchliche Zeitschrift*): —

"Civilization arrayed in its modernistic garb is too often the god of the man of to-day. The civilization of to-day has been built upon an economic order which is contrary to the teaching of Christ and for that very reason has come tumbling down on our heads. Let us listen to familiar words found in the Sermon on the Mount [R. V.]: 'Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon the earth, where moth and rust consume and where thieves break through and steal; but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth consume and where thieves do not break through nor steal; for where thy treasure is, there will thy heart be also. . . . No man can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one and love the other, or else he will hold to the one and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon.'

"On other occasions Jesus likewise stressed the barrier between rich men and covetous men and the kingdom of God. We say rich men and covetous men; for the lust of more than is needful for daily life has gripped not only those who have been successful in laying up treasures on earth, but also planners of all sorts of material programs, who look with longing eyes upon the spoils of others. There have been covetous men and women in our churches who waxed fat upon bubbles which they never expected to burst. Even some 'self-made' capitalists numbered among us 'went to their own place' as the bubble burst and they were unable to face the world as poor, but honest men. We have even had covetous men in the ministry who have spent their time in the service of mammon rather than of God. Capitalism in the making has seldom recognized its moral and social obligation to its employee or its neighbor, nor has it felt sufficient responsibility in times of unemployment. It has more often established foundations for peace and education upon the spoils of war and ignorance. Then, again, the lure of salaried secretaryships in all sorts of foundations has robbed us of potential volunteers in the furtherance of causes so obviously right they have been harmed rather than helped by the introduction of the puppets of dictators and dictatorial policies. The Christian Church believes in consecrated wealth at work for God and our neighbor as a self-evident stewardship and in a consecration on the part of those of us who have no wealth which does not look with fixed and forbidding eye upon our more successful neighbors. . . .

"Society is being molded to-day by certain sinister and certain other superficial 'motivations,' which are pulling the crowd away from organized religion and toward a developing atheism. We seem to have lost all sense of sin. The word itself has been dropped from the vocabulary of the average person. We are told that we are suffering to-day from crime waves

rather than from epidemics of sin. These crime waves have given birth to the epics and biographies of our day and have provided society with thrills and guns — guns for the criminals, guns for our homes, guns for motion-picture actors, guns for officers of the law, guns for the nine- and ten-year-olds, as the commandment 'Thou shalt not kill' has been translated for our modern Decalog into 'Thou shalt know how to kill.' As a matter of fact, much of our modern social mechanism functions according to the following revised Decalog: 1. There is no God, and thou shalt have none. 2. Curse and prove God non-existent. 3. Forget the Sabbath and keep it joyfully. 4. Teach your parents the meaning of life. 5. Know how to kill if necessary. 6. Cultivate sex. 7. Get what you can while you can, howsoever you can. 8. Perjury means nothing. 9. There are no property rights. 10. There is nothing sacred about the home and its relationships.

"In each case we have noted the direct opposite of the Mosaic commandment, and we stand dumbfounded as we realize that we have penned a code which finds acceptance in the hearts and lives of many citizens and leaders in modern society. Does this not prove that we are standing on the brink of a yawning abyss? Is it too late to turn back?

"In view of the pull of present-day civilization away from the Christian Church and because of our earnest conviction that the Christian Church is needed to-day as never before to keep humanity from its planned plunge into the dark, it is essential that we chart the task of the Church.

"The primary job before us is to rebuild the Church upon the one foundation which has outlasted the ravages of the ages and of countless wars, and that foundation is Christ. 'For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.' Unfortunately the Church of the past decade or two has believed it to be its primary duty to add buildings to a compound rather than additional stories to the main building. We have thought that by decentralizing an institution and by humanizing it we were building a bigger and better Church, and we have come to know that we have added liabilities, and not assets, to our structure."

J. H. C. F.

Congregationalist-Catholic. — Studying the *Foundations of Faith* by Dr. W. E. Orchard, published some years ago, one wondered how this noted Congregationalist theologian could pen the following: "The question of whether Christ's righteousness is *imputed* or *imparted* to us has been a source of great dispute between Catholics and Protestants. It might be thought there was Scriptural basis for the doctrine of imputed righteousness; but this is denied by Catholic exegetes; and whether it is Scriptural or not, belief in it has now been almost entirely surrendered by thoughtful Protestants." And by Orchard himself. "The blood of Christ . . . brings about the remission of sins by destroying our very love for sin and taking away any further taste for it." (II, pp. 181. 191.) That is essentially the Catholic doctrine of justification by *gratia infusa*. Congregationalists are supposed to teach justification by faith. One wonders why Dr. Orchard was considered a Congregationalist. — An article published in the *Congregationalist and Herald of Gospel Liberty* of July 14, entitled "Dr. Orchard goes to Rome," says: "The announcement that Dr. W. E. Orchard, formerly of King's Weigh House Chapel, London, England, has left the Congregational fellowship to join the Roman Catholic Church,

while it may occasion surprise, will seem to many who have followed Dr. Orchard's course in recent years to represent the logic of what has been, and has become increasingly, the particular emphasis in his religious thought and practise." One does not wonder that Dr. Orchard went to Rome. He belonged there. One only wonders why not more of the modern Protestants follow him. — The *Congregationalist's* obituary goes on to say: "For our own part we regret that Dr. Orchard has abandoned that witness to catholicity in independency. We have had little sympathy with the formal expression of Dr. Orchard's religious views and attitude, but we have had the deepest sympathy with the conception of Congregational freedom which made possible that expression within the Congregational fellowship." Now we no longer wonder how the Catholic Dr. Orchard could remain in the Congregationalist Church so long. He was welcome there. According to the Congregationalist system "each candidate for membership, each church or conference seeking recognition determines freely what is accepted of faith. On the other hand, each organization decides for itself whether the confession of an applicant is sufficient." (*Schaff-Herzog Encycl.*) That is called the freedom and responsibility of the individual soul and the right of private judgment. And here we have the *Congregationalist* explaining to us that "the conception of Congregational freedom," its "independency," made it possible to harbor Dr. Orchard in their midst. They will not even draw the line at Liberals and Unitarians. They will even do this: "In the last *Year-book* of the Congregational Christian churches are listed the names of 571 men from other denominations now serving Congregational churches and still maintaining standing in their own denomination." (*Congregationalist*, Feb. 25, 1932.) E.

The Plight of Reformed Protestantism. — Using the title "A Question for Protestants," a pastor contributes an editorial to the *Congregationalist and Herald of Gospel Liberty* which throughout is in a minor key and ends, his disclaimer to the contrary notwithstanding, in a note of distinct pessimism. These are his thoughts briefly summarized: A trip through New England on a Sunday morning last summer took him past well-attended Roman Catholic and poorly attended Protestant churches. "Even union services in the larger places showed little sign of an envioning interest." An old Protestant church which is far into its third century of existence, a beautiful structure, well equipped with organ and chimes and tastily decorated, a meeting-place which thirty years ago was regularly attended by 150 worshipers, hardly can boast one-third of that number to-day. "Church suppers are well attended, but mid-week services have been abandoned." Dr. Fosdick, writing in a college paper, in analyzing the actual state of affairs, says that merely a handful of students regularly attend divine services and that there seems to be a general lack of interest in the Church. And yet the particular students he has in mind are from average American homes and among the best representatives of our youth. One must remember of course that charitable relief, social service, art, literature, education, are no longer so closely allied with the Church as used to be the case. Education has been taken over by the State, relief work by various public or private agencies. Exceptionally gifted preachers still attract large congregations, but that does not furnish any comfort. The Church in the future as in the past will have to be ministered to

chiefly by average men. Twenty years ago a much-discussed article was written bearing the caption "Why Smith Does Not Go to Church." The answer given was that Smith was repelled by sectarian divisions. But our author feels no assurance that "a single Protestant church where only one is necessary would have crowded pews." Avowing that he is not "an apostle of gloom," the writer quotes Willard Sperry, who remarked that "the Church is always in the throes of her dissolution, but her demise is forever delayed." He concludes: "The Protestant Church is based on a service of worship assumed to have power to nurture the soul of man. Steadily in these days interest is declining in such services in the average church. What will happen to the soul of man? Incidentally, but still a matter of interest, what is to be the future of the Church, thus losing its chief reason for existence?" It is a dark picture which is here drawn, and for once the colors are not deceiving. The causes of the disastrous situation are mainly two. In the first place, in very many of the pulpits of Reformed churches the Word of God is no longer proclaimed. In the second place, the youth of the Church is not indoctrinated. Will Lutherans read and heed the warning written on the wall of other Protestant denominations?

A.

Presbyterian Pelagianism. — Under this heading, Prof. Dr. Wm. C. Robinson, professor of Church History in Columbia Theological Seminary, Decatur, Georgia, in the mid-October issue of *Christianity To-day*, severely reprimands such Pelagian Presbyterians as John Oman (*Grace and Personality*) and others who disagree so profoundly with the doctrines of the Westminster Confession "that one wonders by what liberality of interpretation they can find any substance of their faith in these Presbyterian standards." "Their Pelagianism out-Pelagianizes Pelagius"; it may be stated in the lines of the Chinese classic: —

"Men, one and all, in infancy
Are virtuous at heart;
Their moral tendencies the same,
Their practises wide apart.
Without instruction's kindly aid
Men's nature grows less fair;
In teaching, thoroughness should be
A never-ceasing care." (Translated by Giles.)

Men of Oman's stamp are Kantians and agree with Kant's axiom that man has the ability to do whatever the Moral Law demands. However, Pelagianism is nothing but naturalism, which "out of the caves of the old man creeps upon every man and every minister." "Only eternal vigilance and the continual illumination by the Word and the Spirit can keep any preacher from repeating its suave phrases." These are some of the thoughts which the writer stresses, and very timely and necessary thoughts they are. Pelagianism is still the most insidious enemy of the Christian faith, and the theological professors must never cease exposing it and testifying against it.

According to Dr. Robinson, Pelagianism accounts for the fact that there are to-day so "many calls for church affiliation and union." His indictment of the Federal Council is worth considering. He writes: "A Pelagian desire for a great ecclesiastical machine with sufficient num-

bers to dominate State politics is one reason why there are so many calls for church affiliation and union. This purpose may be unknown or unrealized to many good men who push such schemes. The writer has the highest regard for the doctrinal soundness of certain ones of his brother ministers both in the North and in the South who have recently advocated membership in the Federal Council. These particular brethren could never be Pelagians themselves. They would never consciously tolerate a Pelagian position for their churches. May the writer have the temerity to ask them to consider whether in supporting the Federal Council they are not unconsciously asking their respective churches to take a position which is logically Pelagian? Does not the history of the Federal Council to date show that Presbyterian churches have held membership in it only at the cost of *sacrificing the Gospel to the social gospel*? And is this not *Pelagianism*?" It is certainly quite profitable for Christians holding membership in the Federal Council or seeking such membership to consider these questions of the frank writer.

J. T. M.

Religious Magazines Suspend Publication. — Under this heading the *Watchman-Examiner* of October 6, 1932, writes: — "A quarterly magazine of unusual clarity, fidelity to God's Word, and of general excellence has been the *Biblical Review*, published by the Biblical Seminary in New York and edited by Robert M. Kurtz. A note announces to us that because of financial reasons particularly the quarterly has been obliged to suspend publication. The *Review* has been a large expense to the seminary, and it feels that in these circumstances even the excellency of the magazine does not justify the expenditure of the money necessary to its maintenance. The *Christian Fundamentalist*, a monthly published by the World's Christian Fundamentals Association and edited by Dr. W. B. Riley of Minneapolis, has also suspended publication. Three reasons are given. First, Dr. Riley's health will not permit him to continue the almost innumerable tasks to which he has set his hand. Secondly, Dr. Riley has arranged to spend the coming fall and winter in a continent-wide campaign of Bible-teaching and evangelism. Thirdly, the financial load is too heavy to bear at this time. Dr. Ridey expresses the purpose to supply the news of the World's Christian Fundamentals Association through the *Pilot*, a magazine published in the interest of the Northwestern Bible and Missionary Training-school, of which he is the president. It is with regret that we announce the suspension of these two publications. It simply shows the way the wind is blowing."

J. T. M.

A Record Enrolment at Westminster Seminary. — Westminster Theological Seminary in Philadelphia opened this fall with a record enrolment. On October 12 the student-body numbered 76. This, as *Christianity To-day* reports, includes 29 new students in the Junior Class, 23 students in the Middle Class (of whom 3 are new), 10 students in the Senior Class, 7 students in the graduate division, 5 partial students, and 2 special students. The opening address was delivered by Prof. Dr. J. Gresham Machen, who welcomed the students to a fellowship of testimony, of prayer, and of labor, interpreting their entering Westminster Seminary as a "protest against the current in the Church and in favor of the great doctrines of the Word." "The Seminary," he said, "has only one special task: to help men become real specialists in the Bible."

J. T. M.

Congregationalists Discuss Mission-Treasury Deficit. — Recently at a meeting of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, which is the title of the board of Foreign Missions of the Congregationalists, the deficit of the mission-treasury on which this board is relying for its funds had to be spoken of, and means to remove it had to be considered. From the report of this meeting, as it appeared in the *Christian Century*, we take over one paragraph: —

"Because of declining income the American Board is in process of either detaining in this country or recalling from abroad over sixty missionaries. This is the first time in nearly a century and a quarter of the history of the board that acceptable missionaries in the prime of life have been asked to find other employment for purely financial reasons. As against the release of their colleagues the missionaries in attendance on the meeting of the board offered a counter-proposition — that all take less in order that all might remain at the tasks for which they have been trained. The salaries of the missionaries of the board have already been cut, on the average, 12 per cent., and it was estimated that such a move as this would involve a further reduction of 8 per cent.; and yet the missionaries themselves argued for this move with much enthusiasm and with apparently general unanimity. If a permanent reduction in *personnel* was necessary, they argued, it could best be brought about through the inevitable retirements and resignations of a year or two. The matter was argued first in a meeting of missionaries and secretaries and later in a public meeting of the board, by which it was referred to the Prudential Committee, its directing body. But the spirit of the missionaries was superb."

A.

"Trained in the Classics." — The following is taken from the weekly *America*: "The young gentleman who was chosen class orator at Harvard this year, Paul C. Reardon, is both clear-eyed and courageous. In his address he suggested what some alumni still think is a hoary heresy, to wit, that the Harvard of to-day is not quite the equal of the Harvard that was. Mr. Reardon is convinced that something is lacking, 'an intangible something,' in the Harvard of 1932. Alma mater is not training her sons to go out into the world equipped for leadership. She has her courses in sociology and economics, as the old Harvard did not, but these do not seem to fit students to take an active and intelligent interest in community life. 'Somewhere along this upward path something intangible has been lost.' If you press him for details, Mr. Reardon will answer that the 'something' is a training in the classics. And he points to the Harvard that sent Charles Sumner, Wendell Phillips, and James Russell Lowell out into the world to stir it with controversy and to delight it with beauty. 'They had been trained in the classics.' Possibly Mr. Reardon might have made a better selection among the alumni; all old Harvard men will have their favorites to propose; but we can see what he means, and many will agree. The classical training often resulted in a vision and an energy which the newer modes of academic effort seem unable to arouse and foster. Its students had a link with all that was best in the strength and beauty of the past, even though they had never heard of a graph and still thought that amber was the chief source of electricity. They were not men freighted with facts, but they knew how to relate the facts they had encountered, few or many, with the life they had lived. Palmer, himself a Harvard

teacher long to be remembered, once said that to be a good teacher, a good blacksmith, or a good shopkeeper, one had to be 'human.' That was the purpose of the old classical training. If it did not turn the young men into walking encyclopedias, it did deepen the intellect, strengthen the will, and enlarge the emotions, and so strove to make them both human and humane. — Educators of many creeds and divergent schools are looking wistfully into the past. They are fairly certain that the college which peddles courses, as a department store offers bargains in anything, from axes to lanterns to xylophones, has not succeeded in giving us either leaders or men. It has all the vices of a machine age and few of its virtues; its past is something which educators recall with horror, and its future is bleakness unrelieved. The once despised 'training in the classics' may yet come into its own."

P. E. K.

"Modernism Riding High, Wide, and Handsome." — That is what *Christianity To-day* sees in the "Hall of Religions at the Chicago World's Fair." The building will be erected on the lagoon, adjacent to Lake Michigan, and house the exhibits for Protestant denominations. Statistical data, such as have never before been placed before the public, are being compiled with the avowed purpose of astounding those who declare that "Christianity is on the wane" and that "the Church is losing ground." Refutation of these assaults is the main object of the Committee on Progress through Religion in the erection of this beautiful building. "More important yet is the program of many conferences that will be directed to clarifying the objectives and methods for the solution of present social problems. Emphasis will rest upon cooperation and not upon propaganda for special religious affiliations. These conferences will have for their subjects many phases of religious education, the attitude of youth toward religion, changing forms of worship, the methodology of charity and social service, the cooperation of religious bodies for peace, and the organization of religious leaders for the reduction of poverty." Indeed, "Modernism riding high, wide, and handsome!"

J. T. M.

What Do Episcopalians Believe Touching the Real Presence? — The controversy originated in the Interdenominational Communion Service at Christ Church Cathedral, St. Louis (Episcopalian), has naturally involved a study of what the official position of the Protestant Episcopal Church is on the meaning of the Eucharist. The *Living Church*, sponsoring the views of the ritualists among the Episcopalians, says in its issue of August 13, 1932: —

"The full force of the tradition of the Anglican Church shows very explicitly that the Holy Communion is much more than a commemoration of the Lord's death by a company of believers in fellowship with one another and with Him. It is that indeed, but it is also the means whereby the Holy Spirit sanctifies the elements of bread and wine, so that 'we, receiving them according to . . . our Savior Jesus Christ's holy institution in remembrance of His death and Passion, may be partakers of His most blessed body and blood.' (*Prayer-book*, p. 81.) And again the inward part, or 'spiritual grace,' of the blessed Sacrament 'is the body and blood of Christ, which are spiritually taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper' (p. 293). In other words, the Anglican Church not only agrees with the Protestant bodies that the Holy Communion is a perpetual memorial of our Lord's death, but it goes farther and witnesses to the fact

Congregationalists Discuss Mission-Treasury Deficit. — Recently at a meeting of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, which is the title of the board of Foreign Missions of the Congregationalists, the deficit of the mission-treasury on which this board is relying for its funds had to be spoken of, and means to remove it had to be considered. From the report of this meeting, as it appeared in the *Christian Century*, we take over one paragraph: —

"Because of declining income the American Board is in process of either detaining in this country or recalling from abroad over sixty missionaries. This is the first time in nearly a century and a quarter of the history of the board that acceptable missionaries in the prime of life have been asked to find other employment for purely financial reasons. As against the release of their colleagues the missionaries in attendance on the meeting of the board offered a counter-proposition — that all take less in order that all might remain at the tasks for which they have been trained. The salaries of the missionaries of the board have already been cut, on the average, 12 per cent., and it was estimated that such a move as this would involve a further reduction of 8 per cent.; and yet the missionaries themselves argued for this move with much enthusiasm and with apparently general unanimity. If a permanent reduction in *personnel* was necessary, they argued, it could best be brought about through the inevitable retirements and resignations of a year or two. The matter was argued first in a meeting of missionaries and secretaries and later in a public meeting of the board, by which it was referred to the Prudential Committee, its directing body. But the spirit of the missionaries was superb."

A.

"Trained in the Classics." — The following is taken from the weekly *America*: "The young gentleman who was chosen class orator at Harvard this year, Paul C. Reardon, is both clear-eyed and courageous. In his address he suggested what some alumni still think is a hoary heresy, to wit, that the Harvard of to-day is not quite the equal of the Harvard that was. Mr. Reardon is convinced that something is lacking, 'an intangible something,' in the Harvard of 1932. Alma mater is not training her sons to go out into the world equipped for leadership. She has her courses in sociology and economics, as the old Harvard did not, but these do not seem to fit students to take an active and intelligent interest in community life. 'Somewhere along this upward path something intangible has been lost.' If you press him for details, Mr. Reardon will answer that the 'something' is a training in the classics. And he points to the Harvard that sent Charles Sumner, Wendell Phillips, and James Russell Lowell out into the world to stir it with controversy and to delight it with beauty. 'They had been trained in the classics.' Possibly Mr. Reardon might have made a better selection among the alumni; all old Harvard men will have their favorites to propose; but we can see what he means, and many will agree. The classical training often resulted in a vision and an energy which the newer modes of academic effort seem unable to arouse and foster. Its students had a link with all that was best in the strength and beauty of the past, even though they had never heard of a graph and still thought that amber was the chief source of electricity. They were not men freighted with facts, but they knew how to relate the facts they had encountered, few or many, with the life they had lived. Palmer, himself a Harvard

teacher long to be remembered, once said that to be a good teacher, a good blacksmith, or a good shopkeeper, one had to be 'human.' That was the purpose of the old classical training. If it did not turn the young men into walking encyclopedias, it did deepen the intellect, strengthen the will, and enlarge the emotions, and so strove to make them both human and humane. — Educators of many creeds and divergent schools are looking wistfully into the past. They are fairly certain that the college which peddles courses, as a department store offers bargains in anything, from axes to lanterns to xylophones, has not succeeded in giving us either leaders or men. It has all the vices of a machine age and few of its virtues; its past is something which educators recall with horror, and its future is bleakness unrelieved. The once despised 'training in the classics' may yet come into its own."

P. E. K.

"Modernism Riding High, Wide, and Handsome." — That is what *Christianity To-day* sees in the "Hall of Religions at the Chicago World's Fair." The building will be erected on the lagoon, adjacent to Lake Michigan, and house the exhibits for Protestant denominations. Statistical data, such as have never before been placed before the public, are being compiled with the avowed purpose of astounding those who declare that "Christianity is on the wane" and that "the Church is losing ground." Refutation of these assaults is the main object of the Committee on Progress through Religion in the erection of this beautiful building. "More important yet is the program of many conferences that will be directed to clarifying the objectives and methods for the solution of present social problems. Emphasis will rest upon cooperation and not upon propaganda for special religious affiliations. These conferences will have for their subjects many phases of religious education, the attitude of youth toward religion, changing forms of worship, the methodology of charity and social service, the cooperation of religious bodies for peace, and the organization of religious leaders for the reduction of poverty." Indeed, "Modernism riding high, wide, and handsome"!

J. T. M.

What Do Episcopalians Believe Touching the Real Presence? — The controversy originated in the Interdenominational Communion Service at Christ Church Cathedral, St. Louis (Episcopalian), has naturally involved a study of what the official position of the Protestant Episcopal Church is on the meaning of the Eucharist. The *Living Church*, sponsoring the views of the ritualists among the Episcopalians, says in its issue of August 13, 1932: —

"The full force of the tradition of the Anglican Church shows very explicitly that the Holy Communion is much more than a commemoration of the Lord's death by a company of believers in fellowship with one another and with Him. It is that indeed, but it is also the means whereby the Holy Spirit sanctifies the elements of bread and wine, so that 'we, receiving them according to . . . our Savior Jesus Christ's holy institution in remembrance of His death and Passion, may be partakers of His most blessed body and blood.' (*Prayer-book*, p. 81.) And again the inward part, or 'spiritual grace,' of the blessed Sacrament 'is the body and blood of Christ, which are spiritually taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper' (p. 293). In other words, the Anglican Church not only agrees with the Protestant bodies that the Holy Communion is a perpetual memorial of our Lord's death, but it goes farther and witnesses to the fact

that the blessed Sacrament is in truth His very body and blood. Most Protestants, probably all of those who participated in the St. Louis service, have lost this witness. To them there is no Real Presence in the Holy Communion, which is simply a memorial celebration and an expression of fellowship. It is exactly because the Anglican Church has been faithful to its witness to the Real Presence that it has maintained the need of a divinely ordained sacrificing priesthood to celebrate the Holy Eucharist," etc.

Reading these words superficially, one gets the impression that Episcopalians teach what we Lutherans hold concerning the Lord's Supper, that is, that in, with, and under the bread and wine Christ's body and blood are imparted to the communicants. Unfortunately the *Prayer-book* itself, in the appendix containing the Thirty-nine Articles of the Anglican Church, puts a veto on such a favorable view. There very explicitly it is stated that unbelievers do not receive Christ's body and blood, so that it becomes quite apparent that the eating and drinking of Christ's body and blood professed by Anglicans is one that is performed by faith, a spiritual eating and drinking, and not that sacramental communion which is taught in the Scriptures and confessed by the Lutheran Church. A.

"We Fair-Weather Modernists."—It is not often that Biblical Christianity can assent to what Dr. H. E. Fosdick broadcasts over the radio. Now and then, however, he says things that are worth quoting. Recently, in one of his addresses, he reproved the Modernists as follows: "We fair-weather Modernists, with our too easy gospel of God as a sentimental Lover, would better salute those old Christians. They did not blink the facts; instead, they achieved a faith able to rise above the facts and carry off a spiritual victory in the face of them, and at their best, in the darkest hours that ever fell on human history, they stood like houses built on rocks." But Dr. Fosdick has still more to say of his fair-weather fellow-Modernists. *Christianity To-day* quotes him as having said, too: "Old-fashioned religion often did produce an unconsenting and courageous individual conscience. At this point Modernism often fails. It has breadth and easy-going complacency and general good will, but lacks moral grip to lift men above the ordinary levels of daily life and give them courage, if necessary, to defy the world." Again: "We Modernists pare down and dim our faith by negative abstractions until we have left only the ghastly remainder of what was once a great religion. Then seeing how few our positive convictions are and how little they matter, we grow easy going about every one else's convictions and end in a mush of general concessions." All this has been said before by Biblical Christians, but it is well for us to learn how Modernists themselves regard the idolatrous stuff which they offer to the world in the name of religion. But if it is so worthless, why do they continue to preach it? J. T. M.

Languages Used in Europe.—The International Linguistic Office in Geneva recently released the information that of the 125 independent languages which are spoken in Europe, German is used by eighty-one million, occupying first place. According to the tabulation the Russian language is second, with seventy million; English, forty-seven million; Italian, forty-one million; French, thirty-nine million.

News Bulletin of N. L. C.

II. Ausland.

Karl Barth und der Katholizismus. Unter dieser Überschrift teilt Rektor Willkomm eine kürzlich getane Aussprache des bekannten deutschen Theologen dialektischer Richtung Karl Barth über den Katholizismus mit, die nicht ohne Bedeutung ist. Barth schreibt: „Sie könnten sich fragen, warum ich gerade in dieser Angelegenheit so scharf werde, statt Ihren Angriff schweigend zu meinen reichen Akten ähnlicher Art zu legen. Ich will es Ihnen sagen: darum werde ich scharf, weil ich in Sachen des Katholizismus keinen Spaß verstehe. Ich meine einigermassen zu wissen, was Katholizismus ist, und meine, mir Mühe geben zu sollen, es immer besser zu wissen. Ich halte ihn für einen unheimlich starken und tiefen, letztlich für den einzigen wirklich ernst zu nehmenden Gesprächsgegner der evangelischen Theologie. Ich halte den Idealismus und die Anthroposophie und die völkische Religion und die Gottlosenbewegung für Kindereien, gemessen an diesem Gegner. Ich leide darunter, daß die evangelische Theologie hier blind ist, daß sie nicht merkt, zu welcher geistigen und geistlichen Bedeutungslosigkeit sie in einer zweihundertjährigen Entwicklung heruntergekommen, wie wenig sie dem Katholizismus heute innerlich gewachsen ist. Meine ganze Arbeit gilt der ver- zweifelten Frage nach einer evangelischen Theologie, die dem Katholizismus, den ich für die große Häresie halte, würdig — als Theologie und als evangelische Theologie würdig! — gegenüberstehen möchte. Ich behaupte kühnlich, daß ich einer der ganz wenigen evangelischen Theologen bin, die einerseits den Römischen hinsichtlich der gemeinchristlichen Voraussetzungen ruhig ins Auge blicken können und die andererseits weder mit der Erkenntnislehre des Vatikanischen noch mit der Rechtfertigungslehre des Tridentinischen Konzils einen heimlichen Bund geschlossen haben. Ich weiß aber auch, was es für eine Last ist, so — und man kann es nur so sein — evangelischer Theolog zu sein.“

Darauf erwidert Rektor Willkomm ganz richtig: „Die lutherische Kirche und Theologie hat schon längst in Rom den Erbfeind des Protestantismus und im Papst den rechten großen Antichristen erkannt, weil er an Stelle der Schrift ‚den Schrein seines Herzens‘ zur theologischen Erkenntnisquelle macht und die Rechtfertigungslehre des Evangeliums unter Anathema gestellt hat und dabei vorgibt, er sei der Statthalter Christi auf Erden, und sich so ‚in den Tempel Gottes‘ setzt, 2 Thess. 2. Nur könnte man noch hinzufügen, daß auch Barth nicht mit scharfen Waffen gegen das Papsttum kämpfen kann, solange er nicht zu dem Standpunkt Luthers in bezug auf die wörtliche Eingebung der Heiligen Schrift und die Gnadenmittel zurückkehrt. Schließlich ist die dialektische Theologie doch ebenso rationalistisch wie der Papiismus. Das Kämpfen gegen den Antichristen mit rechten Waffen muß man von Luther lernen. Und dabei muß man vor allem wissen, was es mit dem sola gratia und dem sola Scriptura eines Luther auf sich hat.“ J. L. W.

Die Methode der Irrlehrer in der Landeskirche. In den neuesten Nummern kirchlicher Blätter gedenkt man des hundertsten Geburtstages D. Emil Sulzes, eines radikal ungläubigen Pastors der Landeskirche ähnlich wie „Pfarrer“ Busch in Dresden. Sulze hat in den siebziger Jahren des vorigen Jahrhunderts sein Gift in Chemnitz und Dresden ausgestreut. Er griff auch die sächsische Separation heftig an und weisagte ihr den sicheren

Untergang. Er veröffentlichte eine Schrift mit dem Titel „Nachweis, daß Herr P. Ruhland in Niederplanitz kein Lutheraner, sondern ein Katholik und Papist ist“. Darauf erwiderte unser treuer Ruhland, der erste Pastor der freikirchlichen Gemeinde in Dresden und Planitz, mit einem Traktat, betitelt „Antwort auf D. Sulzes Narrenschrift. . .“

Sulze wurde weit und breit der Prediger eines Christentums ohne Christum genannt. Christus war ihm bloßer Mensch. Er meinte, eher könne ein Mensch Quadersteine verdauen, als sich den „dreipersönlichen“ Gott aneignen. Die lutherische Abendmahlslehre nannte er materialistischen Aberglauben, die Wirkung der Taufe Zauberei. Er leugnete den Zorn Gottes und die Auferstehung. (Vgl. Meusel, Handlexikon.) Nachdem die sächsische Landeskirche 1871 den alten Religionsseid abgeschafft hatte, erlangte Sulze Anstellung in Chemnitz; denn hier brauchte er nunmehr nur zu geloben, „das Evangelium von Christo nach bestem Wissen und Gewissen“ zu predigen; und unter dieser lagen Formel läßt sich ungemein viel unterdrücken.

Wie Sulze und andere Zirklehrer mit ihm sich den Schafspelz anziehen wissen, unter dem sich der Wolf verbirgt, damit die Gemeinde ja nicht merken soll, welchem Unglauben der Pfarrer huldigt, zeigt ein Brief, den Sulze nach seinem achtzigsten Geburtstag an Dr. Hermann Melker geschrieben hat. Dr. Melker ist gegenwärtig Religionslehrer am Realgymnasium in Zwickau. Der Brief ist in Nr. 10 des „Neuen Sächsischen Kirchenblattes“ vom Jahre 1932 veröffentlicht worden. D. Sulze schreibt an Dr. Melker:

„Tief betrübt hat es mich, daß Sie im Konflikt mit unserm Konfessionalismus sich befinden. Das zwanzigste Jahrhundert soll wieder durch das sechzehnte geistig vernichtet werden. Mich hat man seit Jahrzehnten in Ruhe gelassen. In der Predigt habe ich stets aller Polemik mich enthalten. Hatte ich über eine Wundererzählung zu predigen, dann begann ich mit den Worten: Dies Gleichnis sagt uns usw. Unser Gelübde fordert nur, das Evangelium von Christo pp. zu predigen. Ich würde an Ihrer Stelle sagen: Ich bin der wundergläubigste von allen Menschen. Ich sehe in der natürlichen und der sittlichen Weltforderung und in allem Individuellen absolute Wunder. Die Erzählungen, die Ereignisse berichten, die im Widerspruche gegen Gottes Ordnung zu stehen scheinen, halte ich für Gleichnisse, die Vorgänge des inneren Lebens anschaulich darstellen. Diese Auffassung bewahrt die Jugend gegen Skeptizismus und Naturalismus. Wird mir dies nicht gestattet, so macht mit mir, was Ihr wollt; verantwortet es aber, wenn die Jugend dem Atheismus verfällt.“

Das ist die Methode der Zirklehrer in der Landeskirche: in der Predigt, auf der Kanzel den Unglauben nach Möglichkeit verbergen und die in der Bibel geoffenbarten Heilswahrheiten und Wunder schlaue umdeuten; viele werden's ja doch nicht merken! Die Duldung des Zirklehrers Sulze in der sächsischen Landeskirche war damals für viele Veranlassung, aus der Landeskirche auszutreten. Heute hat man sich längst damit abgefunden, daß der Zirklehrer „Pfarrer“ Dr. Busch in Dresden auch weiterhin in der Landeskirche geduldet wird und mit ihm noch viele andere.

(G. Herrmann in der „Freikirche“.)

The United Methodist Church of Great Britain. — Once before we briefly alluded to the consummation of the union of the three Methodist bodies in Great Britain and Ireland, the Western Methodists, the Primitive Methodists, and the United Methodist Church. It was on September 20 of the past year when this historical event occurred. The Rev. Edward Shillito, reporting the occasion for the *Christian Century*, writes: "There were ten thousand eye-witnesses in the Albert Hall, London, when the president of the uniting conference and the three presidents of the churches uniting put their signatures on a sheet of vellum which contained the deed of union and the vast assembly sang the *Te Deum*." We are told that this union has come as the result of long-continued efforts sorely trying the patience of those who were the chief advocates of this movement. There was a party in the Methodist Church which feared that to bring these three Methodist bodies together would mean a widening of the gulf between Methodists and Anglicans. "To this day the service of Holy Communion in British Methodism is practically identical with the service in the *Book of Common Prayer*, and there are those who look for something more than the reunion of Methodism." Then there were the differences which originally had led to the division. The Wesleyans, so our informant tells us, "gave a more important part to their ministry in their councils." On the whole, the causes for division were unimportant and were due to the overemphasis of Reformed churches on things that belong to the sphere of adiaphora. Mr. Shillito thinks that critics will be disconcerted who have been telling the world "that the Reformed churches were splitting into sects so rapidly that there would be nothing left before long but a confusion of groups."

Anybody can see that a number of delicate adjustments have to be made as a result of the union. The new church-body will number five thousand ministers and about one million communicant members. From the point of view of organization the new Methodist Church will be an efficient organization. We quote: "No churches have ever been more efficient; the Methodist Church will make all others seem amateur concerns so far as organization is concerned." Mr. Shillito, however, states in his concluding remarks: "Methodism lives or dies with its passionate evangelism. It has no creed of its own; it has not even a church order of its own; for Methodism is one variety of Presbyterianism. It is a catholic community with one distinctive mission, to preach to all men the grace of God, and by that it will live."

If the blessed Gospel will through this union be given a wider proclamation and greater victories, we shall rejoice in spite of the severe strictures which we have to apply to Methodist teachings. It is stated in some quarters that grave concessions to Modernism have found their way into the doctrinal basis of the new body, so that the editor of the *Fundamentalist*, Dr. H. C. Morton, felt constrained to oppose its adoption. Dr. John Scott Lidgett is president of the United Methodist Church of Great Britain.

A.

Lutheran Seminary at Sondershausen. — In a beautiful medieval prince's castle in Sondershausen there was recently opened a theological seminary of significance to the whole Lutheran world. It is the culmination of a suggestion made by Dr. Joergensen at the last Lutheran World

Conference at Copenhagen, where he said that it was desirable that the Lutheran Church of the world should have a common theological seminary, a center and fountainhead of Lutheran theology. This suggestion fell upon fertile ground. Prof. Dr. Carl Stange of Goettingen took up the matter and with marvelous success has brought it to its present status. He succeeded in interesting influential friends in and outside of Germany, who labored with him, raised money, and interested other friends in the matter, so that to-day the new central Lutheran theological seminary has a beautiful home, a faculty, and the beginning of an endowment.

At the dedication exercises Lutheran church leaders from Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Holland, and Hungary were present besides those from Germany itself. The new institution is called The Luther Academy, and it is hoped that it will become an international postgraduate school where Lutheran theologians from all lands may gather to gain inspiration and to foster world unity and peace.

The board of administration consists of Dr. Ihmels (president) of Leipzig, Dr. Stange, Dr. Torm of Copenhagen, Archbishop Dr. Eidem of Uppsala, Sweden, and Dr. of Laws Geschen of Leipzig. — *Exchange*.

Methodistic Modernism in Australia. — Methodism, which in doctrinal matters has gone from bad to worse in our own country, is not much better in Australia, as the following quotations from the *Australian Christian Commonwealth*, published in the *Australian Lutheran* of September 2, 1932, shows. The writer is a Methodist editor, evidently a man of high standing and great influence in his Church. We cite only a few of his blasphemies.

With regard to the doctrine of inspiration he says: "To assert the inerrancy of the Bible in the face of the plain facts to the contrary is intellectual dishonesty. This is the sin of Fundamentalism. Fundamentalism therefore is a lie. The basic doctrine of Fundamentalism is the verbal inerrancy of the Bible. That doctrine has neither the semblance nor the substance of truth. It is just plain, unmitigated falsehood. Yet Fundamentalism is based upon it, and the so-called Fundamentals Association has been organized to promulgate that sorry untruth. The dogma that the words of the Bible are magically [*sic!*] free from literal error is a Reformation backwash. Not that Luther taught it. He denied it vehemently and frequently. Neither Luther nor Wesley believed in the infallibility of the Bible. Historically the superstition is much older than the Reformation, but in the forms it assumes to-day it is mainly an inheritance from the baser movements of the Reformation period. Verbal inspiration is not a stone in the arch of truth. It is not truth at all, but downright demonstrable falsehood."

This Methodist editor has manifestly read the writings of modern German rationalists who assert with the same emphasis as does the writer in the *Australian Christian Commonwealth* that Luther's attitude toward Scripture was "rather liberal" and that on account of his liberal attitude he never taught the verbal inspiration of the Bible. As a matter of fact, Luther was so convinced that "the Bible is the Holy Ghost's Book" that he would not find mistakes even in the chronological reports of Scripture. If the writer denounces the doctrine of the verbal inspiration as a "Reformation backwash," he may rest assured that his own uncritical and super-

ficial attitude toward the Holy Scriptures is a "satanic backwash," which brought about the fall of man. In his matchless *Christian Dogmatics* Dr. F. Pieper points out that quite commonly the denial of the inspiration of the Bible and the denial of the vicarious atonement of Christ go hand in hand. The Methodist editor is no exception to that rule. Of the *satisfactio vicaria* he writes: "I reject the substitutionary theory because it is thin, formal, and superficial. It simulates the form of a few scriptures [?] and denies the spirit of all Scriptures."

Fortunately there are believing Christians even among the Methodists of Australia. This is what one reader of the *Australian Christian Commonwealth* wrote in reply to the ungodly editor of his church-paper: "I (along with many other loyal members of the Methodist Church) am deeply pained from time to time by articles appearing in the *A. C. C.* In these days of deep perplexity and distress we look to our church-paper to bring to our hearts words of hope, encouragement, admonition, reproof, and counsel; but instead we frequently find . . . articles teaching evolution and Modernism, written by people who must surely have had their eyes blinded by unbelief." "Seeking bread, the readers are offered a stone," comments the *Australian Lutheran*. "And why? Because Modernism reigns supreme in the editorial chair."

J. T. M.

Ist der Zionismus Anfang der Belehrung Israels? Im „Christl. Apologeten“ lesen wir über diesen Gegenstand: „Hierzu schreibt der ‚Vote aus Zion‘ in seinem Dezemberheft folgendes: Die Frage kehrt oft wieder in den Briefen unserer Freunde. Darauf antwortet P. Päßold, der fünf Jahre die deutsche Gemeinde in Jaffa in Palästina bedient und also die dortige neue Judenstadt Tell Abib mit ihren 40,000 Juden täglich vor Augen hatte, wie folgt: ‚Merkwürdig, der heutige Jude hält einerseits an den religiösen Gebräuchen seines Volkes fest; andererseits kümmert er sich nur um sein Volkstum und fragt wenig oder nichts nach Gott und Religion. Ein nach Palästina einwanderndes jüdisches Mädchen äußerte, sie habe noch einen Gottesglauben, aber sie wisse, daß ihr dieser in Palästina genommen werde. So ist es fast durchweg. Die Gottesleugnung herrscht vor. Ein gelehrter Jude, Prof. Klausner an der jüdischen ‚Universität‘ in Jerusalem, hat neulich ein umfangreiches Buch über ‚Jesus von Nazareth‘ geschrieben. Hebräisch hat es schon vier, in England sieben Auflagen erlebt und ist jetzt auch deutsch in Berlin erschienen. Der Verfasser will ohne religiöses Interesse nach dem neuesten Stande der wissenschaftlichen Forschung schreiben. Sein Ergebnis ist: Jesus ist nicht der Messias, nicht ein Prophet, sondern nur ein hoher Sittenlehrer und ausgezeichnete Gleichnisredner und Fabeldichter gewesen. Die Judenmission empfindet dies Buch als einen Angriff auf das Evangelium. Das Denken der Juden in Tell Abib, wo neun Zehntel der Bewohner Zionisten sind, ist ferne vom Gottesglauben, vielmehr von Gott los. Fast durchweg herrscht religiöse Gleichgültigkeit oder entschiedene Gottesleugnung.“

J. T. M.

Methodists in England Have Consummated Union. — The correspondent of the *Christian Century* reported some time ago: "Plans are going ahead for the great union of the Wesleyan Methodist, the Primitive Methodist, and the United Methodist churches in the autumn of this year. September 20 will open with prayer and thanksgiving at Wesley's chapel. The 'unity conference' will take place in the Albert Hall that night. On

the three following days conferences will be continued in the Central Hall, Westminster, and on September 24 there will be a great demonstration in Hyde Park." We can now state that the above program was carried out and that the three bodies mentioned have united. We hope to be able to give a more complete report at some later date. A.

Church of Scotland Will Hold Conference with Church of England. — Information from Scotland says that at its recent meeting the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland decided to accept the invitation issued by the Archbishop of Canterbury for a "conference with representatives of the Anglican communion." We are told that the Archbishop of Canterbury was present in person and pleaded for favorable action on the invitation which he presented as president of the Lambeth Conference of 1930. The purpose, so he told the Scotch Presbyterians, was not to agree on terms of organic union between the two churches, so that both would have the same form of government. The aim, as he described it, was merely to manifest to the world "the unity of the body of Christ." The report on which we are basing these remarks, sent by the *Christian Century* correspondent in Glasgow, says touching the reaction of the assembly to the invitation: "Three points of view were put forward. There were those who favored declining the invitation. As one speaker expressed it, 'A flirtation with a Church only half Protestant would be most unwise.' There were those who approved, but thought the time was not yet ripe for such a conference. And finally there were those who were whole-heartedly in favor of accepting. The latter won the day with a good majority." A.

Wie die Juden Jesum „lieben“. Man schreibt gegenwärtig viel davon, daß sich unter den Juden hiezulande vielfach ein „Liebeserwachen“ gegen Jesum finde. Bekannt ist, daß Prof. Dr. Klausner von der jüdischen Universität in Jerusalem in seinem vor kurzem in hebräischer Sprache erschienenen Werk über Jesum ein Verdammungsurteil über alle „Christlichen“ Theologen ausgesprochen hat, die die Geschichtlichkeit der Person Christi preisgeben. Bekannt ist auch, daß der jüdische Rabbiner Isserman hier in St. Louis am Karfreitag vorlehten Jahres einen Gedächtnisgottesdienst für Jesum abgehalten hat. Rabbi Isserman nannte in seiner Rede Jesum „Israels großen Sohn, dessen Gedächtnis den Juden von heute besonders teuer ist“, und sprach für ihn das jüdische Weihgebet. Aber wie steht es im Grunde mit dieser jüdischen Liebe zu Jesu? Rabbi Isserman bemerkte in seiner Ansprache abschließend, daß er von dem Jesus rede, der gekommen sei, das jüdische Gesetz zu erfüllen, der zu den Füßen der alten Rabbiner gesessen und von ihnen die unergleichliche Höhe jüdischen Geistes und jüdischer Lehre mit ihrem allumfassenden Weitblick, ihrem tiefen Reiz und ihrer Poesie gelernt habe. Der „Luth. Herald“, dem wir diese Mitteilung entnehmen, bemerkt mit Recht: „Das lieft sich alles sehr erfreulich und will doch für das Heil Israels noch wenig bedeuten. Ein Christus, wie er den Talmud- und Reformjuden, den Mohammedanern und den Nachfolgern Gandhis genehm ist, ist nicht der Christus der Evangelien. Das Heil der Welt hängt daran, daß er der Sohn des lebendigen Gottes ist, Mensch geworden, gekreuzigt, begraben, auferstanden, gen Himmel gefahren, und daß er einst wiederkommen wird zur Erlösung der Menschheit, für welche er sein Leben gab — nicht als ein edler Märtyrer, sondern zum Schuldopfer für

die Sünde der Welt, als Lamm Gottes, das da hinwegträgt die Sünde der Welt.“ In seinem jetzt viel gelesenen Buch *Mid-Channel* schreibt der Reformjude Ludwig Lewisoohn über Jesus: “Of course, we know Jesus only through the gospels, which are late and distinctly anti-Jewish and controversial. But it is the Jesus of the gospel that the world has in its mind and conscience. And this Jew has not deeply touched the world. What has moved men and founded empires and destroyed them again is the Christ myth with its great metaphysical drama of original sin and the vicarious atonement and heaven and salvation. But modern Liberals turn from that high exercise of the mythopoetic faculty to the Jesus of the gospel, to the carpenter’s son of Nazareth. And they ask, What of him?” Darauf folgt dann eine lange Abhandlung darüber, was nach Lewisoohns Meinung Jesus wirklich gewesen sei. Zum Schluß schreibt er: “Let me sum up this important matter. To the Jew of all ages, the reasonably instructed Jew, the teaching of Jesus falls cleanly and immediately into two parts: the far greater part, which restates with an incomparable spiritual sweetness and poetic persuasiveness the traditional ethics which Jesus, the Jew, received from his Jewish predecessors and which is therefore true, but not new; the smaller part, which, expressing his ascetic condemnation of human life, his moral pessimism, his assumption of a mystical and suprahuman authority, the Jew rejects at once with every instinct of his heart and mind as both impossible practically and philosophically absurd.” Das ist eine klare Sprache. Die Juden wollen Jesus nicht als Sünderheiland. Das Kreuz Christi ist ihnen ein Ärgernis. Leider werden sie in diesem ihrem Unglauben noch bestärkt durch die heutigen Rationalisten und Modernisten, deren ganze Theologie talmudisch-jüdisch ist. Vergessen wollen wir aber dabei nicht die Auserwählten Gottes, die auch aus dem jüdischen Volk eingeführt werden in Jesu Gnadenreich. J. E. M.

Sittliche Verwilderung in Deutschland. Die „Leipziger Tageszeitung“ schreibt: „Dem *Neulandblatt* Nr. 7 entnehmen wir folgende Angaben: Von dem preussischen Wohlfahrtsminister Hiertsiefer wurde bestätigt, daß auf einem deutschen Mädchengymnasium 53 Prozent der Mädchen geschlechtlichen Verkehr hatten und 47 Prozent geschlechtskrank waren. Der Direktor einer Universitätsklinik erwähnt, daß von 752 Phzeumsschülerinnen des Ortes 100 in Erwartung eines Kindes seien, und stellt eine Zunahme jugendlicher Mütter bis in das gar nicht so seltene vierzehnte Lebensjahr hinein fest. Ein vierzehnjähriges Mädchen, Mitglied eines Wanderflusses, konnte den Urheber seiner Schwangerschaft nicht benennen, da bei Übernachtung auf den Wanderfahrten abends unter den jugendlichen männlichen Teilnehmern die halbwüchsigen Mädchen ausgelost wurden.“ Die Sittlichkeitsverbrechen und die Fälle von Blutschande häufen sich in grauenhafter Weise. So sind seit dem 1. Januar d. J. 92 Fälle schwerer Verurteilung wegen Sittlichkeitsverbrechen in den verschiedensten Städten bekannt geworden, darunter 12 Fälle von Blutschande, 5 Lustmorde, 40 Sittlichkeitsverbrechen an Kindern, 35 an Erwachsenen. Das Jahr 1931 wies eine wahre Flut solcher Fälle auf.“ (N. C. L. R., 15. Juli.)

Das Freidenkertum dringt vor. über das Vordringen des Freidenkertums in die westlichen Länder Europas schreibt das „Ev. Deutschland“: „Nachdem lange Jahre hindurch nur die Länder Ost- und Mitteleuropas von dem Ansturm der Gottlosenbewegung berührt worden waren, rückt die

Frage des kämpfenden Freiidentums auch in westeuropäischen Ländern stärker in den Vordergrund. Auch in Frankreich hat sich eine Union Fédérale des Libres Penseurs Révolutionnaires de France gebildet, die sich in der *Lutte Antireligieuse et Proletarienne* ihr Organ geschaffen hat und nach uns vorliegenden Pressemeldungen eine umfassende Propaganda entfaltet. Die Union gehört der Internationale proletarischer Freidentler an und wendet dieselben Kampfmethoden wie diese an. Besondere Aufmerksamkeit wendet die Union der antireligiösen Arbeit unter den Kindern zu. Den religiösen Festen wird ein neuer Inhalt gegeben, indem sie in proletarische Feste umgewandelt werden. Zur Abwehr ist ein „Informationszentrum über die christlichen und atheistischen Aktionen in der Welt“ (Centre d'Information sur les Activités Chrétiennes et Athées dans le Monde) ins Leben getreten.

J. L. M.

Nestorians Ask for Protection. — In the *Christian Century* we read the following interesting account: —

“The admission of Irak into the League of Nations is a reason for rejoicing among the Arabs all through the Near East and North Africa, but it causes new anxiety to the much-harassed ‘Assyrian’ nation. These Assyrians are a refugee people of the Nestorian confession, who used to live in the mountains of Turkish Kurdistan, but who, after a terrible period of massacres and guerrilla warfare, were forced out of Turkey and arrived finally, through Russia and Persia, in Irak, where they enjoyed safety under the protection of the British régime. Not many of them remain. Tens of thousands have died as a result of constant persecution, of the hardships of migration, and of malaria. Their leader is the ‘Patriarch of the East,’ who acts at the same time as the religious and as the secular head of the nation.

“Patriarch Mar Simon Jesse, who represents one of the oldest churches in the world, a church which at one time covered Asia up to China and India with missions, but which is now reduced to a following of 30,000 believers, is twenty-seven years of age. The explanation of this curious fact is that in the Nestorian Church the new patriarch must be chosen among the nephews of the old patriarch.

“Mar Simon Jesse has just been to Geneva to defend the interests of his nation. He is a vigorous young man, who became patriarch at the age of eleven, then studied in Canterbury and Oxford, and is now fighting desperately to save his nation from total extinction. His purpose in coming to Geneva was to get special League protection for the Assyrian minority in the new independent state of Irak. Unfortunately the status which is being offered to his people does not guarantee a hopeful future. The cumbersome League machinery which deals with minorities will probably not protect the Assyrians adequately. Prof. Adolph Keller, who arranged a reception at which the patriarch could meet various League officials and statesmen and religious leaders, did well to emphasize the challenge which the sufferings of this Christian people bring to our sense of Christian solidarity.”

A.

Prof. David Smith, Deceased. — Professor Smith is well known as the author of the famous life of Christ entitled *In the Days of His Flesh*, which, while not without its defects, is a conservative work. The last years he lived and taught in Belfast, and there he died.

A.

 Book Review. — Literatur.

Die sieben Bußpsalmen. Von D. Martin Luther. Zweite Bearbeitung, 1525. In hochdeutscher Übertragung von P. Lic. S. Pr a g h y l f f i. 1932. Dörffling & Franke, Leipzig. 70 Seiten $5\frac{1}{2} \times 8\frac{1}{2}$. Preis: M. 2.50.

Luthers Auslegung der sieben Bußpsalmen war die erste Schrift, die er selbst im März oder April 1517 dem Druck übergeben hat, nicht für Gelehrte und hochgebildete Leute, sondern für das Volk, wie er selbst in einem Briefe vom 6. Mai 1517 an Scheurl sagt. Der Absatz war so reichend, daß, noch ehe der Druck vollendet war, die ersten Bogen schon wieder aufgelegt wurden. 1525 hat dann der Reformator diese erste Ausgabe übergearbeitet und dabei ganz offen gesagt, daß er jetzt weiter gekommen sei im Verständnis des Textes. (St. L. Ausg. IV, 1659.) Diese zweite Bearbeitung wird hier in einem bequemen Sonderdruck dargeboten. In unserer St. Louiser Ausgabe sind die beiden Bearbeitungen zusammengearbeitet und finden sich Band IV, Kol. 1654. Wir haben aus Anlaß dieser Ausgabe wieder Abschnitte dieser Psalmenauslegung gelesen und finden wieder darin die gewaltige Wucht der neugewonnenen Glaubensüberzeugung Luthers. Justus Jonas hat schon seinerzeit nicht umsonst auf Luthers deutschen Psalter hingewiesen und gesagt, daß er „aus dem Heiligen Geist sei“. Luther ist immer ein großer Schriftausleger, aber ganz besonders hat er auch die Psalmen studiert und in der Schule der Ansehung um so besser verstehen gelernt. Man lese nur wieder einmal seine herrliche Vorrede zum Psalter, nach der Vorrede zum Römerbrief wohl die schönste und inhaltreichste der trefflichen Vorreden Luthers zur Bibel. (St. L. XIV, 20.)

L. F ü r b r i n g e r.

The Son of God. By Albert Payson Terhune. Harper & Brothers, Publishers, New York and London. 222 pages, $6 \times 8\frac{1}{2}$. Price, \$2.00.

The author of this book has many friends and admirers, whom he won through his novels, his dog stories, and contributions to magazines. It was with interest that we opened this volume of his, in which our Savior is placed in contrast with important servants of God mentioned in the Bible — David, Solomon, Samson, Peter, Elijah, and Moses. In several respects we were not disappointed. Mr. Terhune accepts the inspiration of the Scriptures and would like to aid in bringing men to Christ. Here our praise stops. The style the author employs, which resembles the breathless dash of some radio speakers, endeavoring to crowd as many words as possible into a minute and to use as many strong adjectives as they can think of, did not impress us favorably, in spite of its undeniable vivaciousness. Not to speak of positive misstatements, the subjects are not always handled with the reverence which we should like to see exhibited when God's Word is involved. One may well be aware of the sinfulness of the saints of the Old Testament without approving of the harsh language which our author uses in condemning their failings. We could bring quotations to substantiate what we have said if the publishers had not inserted a stern order in the volume forbidding that any part of the text be reproduced in any manner whatsoever without their written permission.

W. ARNDT.

The Ministry. A Translation of "Indledning i Prestetjenesten." By *Gustav Jensen*, Pastor and Theologian of the Church of Norway. . . . Done by *Dr. O. E. Brandt*, Professor of Pastoral Theology at Luther Theological Seminary, St. Paul, Minn. Published by Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis. 1932. 150 pages, 5½×8. Price, \$1.00. Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

We take pleasure in drawing the attention of our clergy to this work, which may serve as a sort of spiritual tonic when the pastor with alarm becomes aware that he is growing cold and worldly in the performance of his holy duties. The table of contents indicates what profitable stirrings there are in store for the pastor perusing this book: 1. The holy ministry is of the Lord. 2. The glory and the responsibility of the holy ministry. 3. The called servant. 4. The ministerial life. 5. The knightly warfare. 6. God's congregation — my congregation. 7. The work of the minister.

The devotional aspect of the discussions is enhanced by short prayers which introduce the various sections. We cannot forbear quoting a few passages. "It would probably not be the poorest mark of a faithful minister if worldly people termed him a Pietist preacher, while at the same time the strong saints entitled him a worldly pastor. Consider what was the experience of Jesus and His forerunner, Matt. 11, 18 f.! It is a very natural development when both these judgments fall on an upright minister. It ought to be so. He should appear to the former as being too severe, to the latter as being too lax." (P. 12 f.) "There is in vogue a kind of Christian preaching whose key-note is this: You are lost, believe on the Lord Christ, and you shall be saved. Each one of these articles is the very truth; none of them can be dispensed with in the testimony of Christ. Still this preaching may be a very imperfect Christian preaching and produce loose and feeble Christians. That will be the case wherever perdition is made the chief inducement to faith; one believes in Christ in order to escape perdition, one believes in Him for *one's own* benefit. This, however, is always but a subsidiary inducement; it is one aspect of the matter, not the essence and kernel of the matter. The essence and kernel of the matter is *Christ* in His glory as the Only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." (P. 127.) It is a book of beautiful warmth and fervor which is here placed before us in the fluent translation of Dr. O. E. Brandt, and we give it our cordial recommendation.

W. ARNDT.

Das christliche Gottesbild in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart. Eine Umzeichnung. Von D. Gustav Aulén. Druck und Verlag von C. Verlagsmann in Gütersloh. 1930. 401 Seiten 6½×9. Preis, gebunden: M. 15.

In diesem gründlichen dogmengeschichtlichen Werk, der Fakultät zu Erlangen gewidmet als Dankesbezeugung für die dem Verfasser verliehene Doktorwürde und von Prof. D. Paul Althaus in dem Geleitwort zur deutschen Übersetzung warm begrüßt als Ausdruck der „Wendung der schwedischen Theologie zu Luther und der damit einsetzenden Erneuerung der Dogmatik“, bespricht der Systematiker und Dogmenhistoriker zu Lund in Schweden die Lehre von Gottes Wesen in ihrem Verhältnis zur christlichen Theologie überhaupt, wie sie nach seinem Urteil dar-

gelegt ist in den Evangelien, den Episteln, von Marcion, den altkirchlichen Theologen, Augustin, Thomas von Aquino, Luther („in dem wir den Höhepunkt der ganzen christlichen Geeschichte sehen“, S. 399), den lutherischen Dogmatikern, der Aufklärung, Schleiermacher, Ritschl, und schließt mit einer Beschreibung der gegenwärtigen Lage („überall innerhalb der Welt des religiösen Denkens brodelnd und gärt es. Vermutlich hat mehr als einer unter uns zunächst den Eindruck eines chaotischen Wirrwarrs. . . . Es muß in Frage gestellt werden, ob wir nicht ein Kentern erleben. . . . Nichtsdestoweniger besitzt dieser Eindruck nur eine relative Berechtigung.“ S. 344—396).

Was die theologische Stellung Aulens betrifft, so seien folgende Punkte genannt. Er leugnet die Verbalinspiration. Die Orthodogie, die „auf der Verbalinspiration gebaute Theologie, ist der Meinung, die alte kirchliche Christologie und Trinitätslehre im Neuen Testament wiederfinden zu können; ja sie findet sogar deren Grundzüge im Alten Testament. . . . Eine derartige Auffassung war prinzipiell durch die herrschende Inspirationslehre bedingt: soll die Bibel in ihrer Ganzheit unfehlbar sein und gleichertweise Gottes Wort, ist es schwer, von einschneidenden Veränderungen zu sprechen. Das Gotteswort muß gleich Gott selbst unveränderlich sein.“ (S. 10.) „Das Hauptgewicht in der Theologie der Orthodogie liegt auf dem Biblizismus. Das Bibelwort spielt jetzt eine dominierendere Rolle als je zuvor in der ganzen Geschichte des christlichen Denkens. Darin liegt die Stärke der Orthodogie, aber auch ihre Schwäche. Die Schwäche gründet in dem Einfluß, der von der Verbalinspirationstheorie ausgeht. Es ist selbstverständlich, daß eine Theorie, die jeder einzelnen Bibelaussage absolute göttliche Autorität zuerkennt, mit innerer Notwendigkeit den Blick für die verschiedenen Richtungen in der Bibel trübt und zu einer Verdunklung des eigentlich christlichen führen muß.“ (S. 254.) Folgerichtig tritt Aulen für Lehrfortbildung ein. Er redet von „hellenistischem und spätjüdischem Einfluß auf die Ausgestaltung der verschiedenen Glaubensvorstellungen bei Paulus und der späteren johanneischen Literatur.“ (S. 35.) „Dennoch ist zu sagen, daß Johannes eine Etappe ist auf dem Weg von Paulus zu Marcion.“ (S. 64.) Es gibt keine „für immer gegebene Lehranschauung“ (S. 249); es gibt eine „immer fortwirkende Gottesoffenbarung“; „dieser Gedanke tritt in Gegensatz zu dem alten Biblizismus und seiner Tendenz, die Gottesoffenbarung in und mit der Bibel ‚abgeschlossen‘ sein zu lassen“ (S. 385 f.). — Ferner verwirft Aulen aufs entschiedenste die lutherische Lehre von der Stellvertretung Christi. Unzähligmal charakterisiert er sie als „die legalistisch geformte Versöhnungslehre der Orthodogie.“ (S. 306. 348 usw.) „Der Gegensatz der göttlichen Liebe und der göttlichen Gerechtigkeit bildete den Hintergrund für die Satisfaktionslehre der Orthodogie.“ (S. 304.) „Die Signatur der Orthodogie ist antimoralistischer Legalismus.“ (S. 255.) Diese „durch das Rechtsschema beherrschte Versöhnungstheorie“ hat die Orthodogie nicht von Paulus geerbt. (S. 44.) Wie Aulen sich die Versöhnung denkt, legt er nicht klar dar. Er redet auch von „Stellvertretung“ (S. 369). „Die göttliche Liebe ist eine Liebe, die sich selbst aufgibt, die den Opferweg geht. . . . Die göttliche Majestät selbst bringt das Opfer, opfert von ihrem Eigenen, opfert sich selbst.“ (S. 42 f.) Bei Abweisung der Wahrheit, daß Christus als Opfer für unsere Sünden starb, schweben diese Aussagen in der Luft. Was Aulen von der Wesenseinheit des Sohnes mit dem Vater denkt und wie er dabei Luther versteht, mögen folgende Aussagen zeigen: „Es muß in diesem Zusammenhang stark unterstrichen werden, daß Luther, der mit der größten Intenität die Wesenseinheit versieht, Christus doch nicht als identisch mit Gott betrachtet: Gott geht nicht in Christus auf. Durchgehends ist bei Luther,

um die alte dogmenhistorische Terminologie anzuwenden, ein subordinatorischer Zug sichtbar. Christus hat teil an der göttlichen Majestät, ja er ist selbst göttliche Majestät. Aber die göttliche Majestät geht nicht in Christus auf. Das Wort, daß der Vater größer ist als ich, ist für Luther lebendig." (S. 182.) „Luther ist nicht der Meinung, daß wir in Jesu einem menschlichen Zeugen von Gott begegnen, sondern wir begegnen Gott selbst." Darauf folgt aber der Satz: „Es ist der göttliche Wille, der direkt und unmittelbar in dies konkrete menschliche Leben, in seine Tat und sein Leiden, eingreift. . . . Dieser menschliche Wille befindet sich nicht nur in Übereinstimmung mit dem göttlichen Willen, in Gleichklang mit ihm, sondern zwischen diesen Willen herrscht volle Einheit, volle unitas. . . . Alles hängt daran, daß es wirklich Gott selbst ist, der sich hier vernehmen läßt, nicht nur ein Zeuge, nicht nur etwas mit Gott Verwandtes, sondern Gottes Eigenes, Gottes eigene ‚Natur‘." (S. 181.) „Christus ist ‚in seiner Natur‘ Gott. Erl. Ausg., lat.; Gal. 1, S. 52." (St. V. Ausg. 9, S. 52.) „Warum? . . . Die göttliche Majestät ist nichts anderes, ist nicht geschieden von der Gottestat, die Christus ausführt." (S. 179.) S. 87 wird der Terminus „wahr' Mensch und wahrer Gott" als „symbolische Sprache" bezeichnet. — Bezeichnenderweise wird am Schluß des Buches als das, „worin für alle Zeiten der eigenartige Charakter und der eigentliche Halt des christlichen Gottesbildes eingeschlossen liegt", genannt „die *sovereäne Liebe*", nicht die Gnade Gottes in Christo, seinem Sohne.

Auf folgende an sich trefflichen Ausführungen sei noch hingewiesen. „Erinnere dich daher, daß wir in der Rechtfertigung, wo wir es alle mit der Überwindung des Gesetzes, der Sünde, des Todes, des Teufels und des Bösen zu tun haben, von keinem andern Gott etwas wissen oder kennen als von dem menschengewordenen und im Fleisch geoffenbarten Gott." (St. V. Ausg., 9, 50.) „Das ist für Luther das A und O. Der Gott des Glaubens, ‚der wahrhaftige Gott‘, ist der Gott, der die Sünder rechtfertigt, der Gott, dessen Bild, dessen Gesinnung uns in Christus und seiner Tat begegnet." (S. 177.) „Wir stoßen hier auf den Herzpunkt von Luthers Lehre: *sola gratia*." (S. 217.) „*Sola gratia* ist und bleibt ein Lösungswort, um welches die Männer der Orthodogie treue Wacht hielten." (S. 274.) „Hier wie überall, wo Luther vom Deus absconditus spricht, hebt er hervor, daß es nicht unsere Aufgabe ist, dieser unerforschlichen und für uns unzugänglichen Gottesmajestät nachzuforschen. Für uns gilt, am Deus revelatus festzuhalten. Wir müssen auf das Wort sehen und diesen unerforschlichen Willen beiseite lassen." (S. 228.) „Besteht die vornehmste Kunst der Theologie in einer dialektischen Ausgleichung zwischen den verschiedenen religiösen Motiven, um sie zu einer möglichst rational geschlossenen Form miteinander zu verbinden, dann ist Thomas von Aquino gewiß der größte unter den Männern des christlichen Denkens, weit größer als Augustin und Luther vielfach übertreffend." (S. 137.) „Wäre dies die höchste Kunst der Theologie, wäre Luther kein Theologe." (S. 165.) „Wir können nicht ohne Überhebung, nicht ohne uns des *crimen laesae maiestatis* schuldig zu machen, die göttliche Handlungsweise vor dem Forum der menschlichen Vernunft und des menschlichen Rechtsbewußtseins zu verteidigen suchen." (S. 231.)

Th. Engel der.

Das Kreuz Christi. Von Paul Alt haus. Furcheverlag, Berlin. 34 Seiten 6x9.

Das vorliegende Büchlein ist ein Sonderabdruck aus dem christologischen Gesamtwerk „Mysterium Christi“, einer Frucht der Arbeit der Stockholmer Theologenkommision, mit Beiträgen von zwölf namhaften Theologen Englands und Deutschlands. Prof. Alt haus unterzieht die lutherisch-kirchliche Lehre vom Ver-

dienst Christi und von der Versöhnung einer Kritik, in der die Darstellung der lutherischen Dogmatik als abweichend von der Lehre Luthers und auch von der Schrift dargestellt wird. Er bestreitet die Schriftmäßigkeit der Darstellung, die von einer Anrechnung des Verdienstes Christi durch Erfüllung des Gesetzes an unserer Statt redet, und stellt dieser Lehre den Satz entgegen, daß das Stellvertretende des Gehorsams Jesu nicht in der Übertragbarkeit seines Gehorsams auf uns, sondern darin besteht, daß „er nur als der ganz Gehorsame uns die Vergebung Gottes bringen kann“ (S. 14). Wir haben uns Christum nicht als „mit Schuldbewußtsein unter Gott leidend“ zu denken (S. 21). Christus hat nicht die Höllestrafen für uns abgebußt (S. 22). Wie diese Sätze mit Luther und mit der Schrift in Einklang gebracht werden können, dafür bleibt D. Althaus den Nachweis schuldig. Von exegetischer Beweisführung findet sich in der ganzen Arbeit auch nicht der erste Ansat; mit Schriftworten wird überhaupt nicht operiert. Ein einziges Mal wird das Neue Testament (2 Kor. 5, S. 5) zitiert. Als Illustration der philosophischen Behandlungsweise, die gegenwärtig auch in konservativen Kreisen deutscher Schultheologie das Feld beherrscht, verdient die kleine Schrift Beachtung.

Th. Gräbner.

Christianity vs. Freemasonry. By Theo. Dierks. 166 pages, 5¼×7¾. Concordia Publishing House. Price, \$1.00.

Pastor Dierks has written a book which should be carefully read and studied by all pastors and laymen who come in contact with members of the Masonic Lodge. Quoting freely from Masonic literature, the author shows the true nature of this antichristian and soul-destroying cult. It is a very valuable addition to the antilodge literature published in our circles. We wish it God's speed on its course.

T. L.

Militia Christi. Vom Wirken des Evangeliums in der studentischen Welt. Von Hanns Vilje unter Mitarbeit anderer. Furchbergerlag, Berlin. 224 Seiten 6×9½.

Eine vor allem der Arbeit der Deutschen Christlichen Studentenvereinigung gewidmete Schrift. In verschiedenen Kapiteln wird die Klage darüber laut, „wie wenig tatsächliche und wertvolle Wirkungen die Jugendbewegung hinterlassen hat“ (seit den Kriegserfahrungen). Eine „allgemeine Unsicherheit gegenüber religiösen Fragen“ ist in der gesamten akademischen Welt Deutschlands Kennzeichen der gegenwärtigen Lage (S. 42). Der Sozialismus hat unter der Studentenschaft abgeflaut (S. 45); dagegen wird „die Vergottung des Volkes oder des Staatsgedankens“ immer mehr herrschend (S. 44). Mit der Bibellektüre und dem Gebet steht es schlimm (S. 49). In geschlechtlichen Fragen — ein „beschämender radikaler Mangel eines klaren sittlichen Urteils“ (S. 51). Hat also im großen und ganzen die hier beschriebene Evangelisationsarbeit unter den Studierenden nur geringe Resultate zu verzeichnen, so erklärt sich uns das aus der oberflächlichen, von Vertiefung christlicher Erkenntnis absehbenden, auch dem kirchlichen Anschluß geradezu entgegenarbeitenden Methode, die nach dem Vorbild des Gemeinschaftswesens und solcher Führer wie Moody und Torrey sowie deutscher Methodisten auf persönliche Erfahrung, Gemütschrittentum und Heiligung den Nachdruck legt. Von viel Liebe zu einer großen Sache, aber auch von einer zu beklagenden Unfähigkeit, in der Ablehnung des kirchlichen Offenbarungsgedankens und dem Verlust der biblischen Rechtfertigungslehre den Grund der seelischen und moralischen Wirren deutscher Universitätsjugend zu erkennen, zeugt diese an Reichszangler a. D. Michaelis gerichtete Denkschrift.

Th. Gräbner.

Miracle Lives of China. By *Rosalind and Jonathan Goforth*. Missionaries to China since 1888. Harper and Brothers, Publishers, New York, N. Y. 157 pages, $5\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{3}{4}$. Price, \$1.50.

This is one of the outstanding books of its kind published in recent years. Dr. and Mrs. Goforth have spent forty years as missionaries in treacherous Manchuria, and this book relates a number of their experiences and shows the power of the Gospel on the lives of those with whom they came in contact. Our pastors will find both information and inspiration in their story.

W. G. POLACK.

Gott und Mensch. Predigten und Reden von D. Ernst von Dryander. Zusammenge stellt von Lic. Karl Grüneisen. Zweite Auflage. 1926. E. Gb. Müllers Verlagsbuchhandlung (Paul Seifer), Halle a. d. S. XIV und 244 Seiten $6 \times 8\frac{3}{4}$, in Pappband gebunden.

Wer im Hinblick auf die sonntägliche Predigt auf der Suche ist nach einem „Dormi Secure“ oder einem „Parati Sermones“, der gehe getrost an dieser Predigtsammlung vorüber; denn mit wenigen Ausnahmen eignen sich die Predigten des bekannten Berliner Hofpredigers nicht für unsere Gemeinden. Wer sich aber für die Predigt im allgemeinen interessiert und dabei versteht, alles zu prüfen und das Gute zu behalten, der greife frisch zu; denn er wird hier mancherlei Schönes und Vehrreiches finden. Dryander verfügte allerdings nicht über eine fulminante Beredsamkeit wie z. B. sein Vorgänger Kögel, dessen Rede „mit ihrer wunderbaren Melodie die Herzen zwang, mit ihrem poetischen Schwung die Seelen hob, mit ihrem Sturmgloidenton die Gewissen erschütterte“ (S. 196). Danach strebte er auch nicht, denn er liebte das Einfache. In dem beigegebenen Aufsatz über „Die Aufgabe der heutigen Predigt“ erklärt er: „Die Wahrheit ist einfach. Sie ist um so überzeugender, je einfacher sie ist. Sie bezeugt sich durch sich selbst. Sie braucht keine Rhetorik noch andere Hilfsmittel. Sie hat kein Prachtkleid und kein Getöse nötig.“ (S. 2.) Dryanders Predigten sind deshalb auch schlicht und sachgemäß, aber immer gediegen und oft geradezu tief sinnig. Manche sind nach Form und Inhalt Meisterwerke. Fast jede Predigt bezeugt, daß Dryander die Gabe hatte, die eigentlichen Textgedanken klar darzulegen und mit großer Geschicklichkeit zur praktischen Anwendung zu bringen. In der Lehre hingegen können wir ihm nicht immer beistimmen. Manche von den Predigten in diesem Bande sind bei außerordentlichen Gelegenheiten gehalten worden, z. B. am vierhundertjährigen Gedächtnistag der Reformation, bei der Grobjährigkeitserklärung des Kronprinzen, bei der Einweihung der Erlöserkirche zu Jerusalem, beim Besuch der britischen Kirchenmänner im Jahre 1909, bei der Einweihung des Berliner Doms, bei der Zweihundertjahrfeier der preußischen Königskrönung und beim Begräbnis von Ernst Curtius. Eine Predigt, die über die Lehrfreiheit (S. 85), wurde anlässlich des Katholikentages gehalten; eine andere ist gegen Drewhs' Christusmythe gerichtet (S. 58).

E. J. Friedrich.

Morgenglanz der Ewigkeit. Handreichung für Schulanachten und für stille Augenblicke. Von R. Frohneher. Quell-Verlag der E. G. Gesellschaft, Stuttgart. 160 Seiten. In Halbleinen gebunden: RM. 2.30; in Ganzleinen: RM. 2.50.

Dieses Buch enthält eine Sammlung kurzer Bibelsprüche, Viederverse und anderer Aussprüche christlicher und unchristlicher Persönlichkeiten aus Vergangenheit und Gegenwart, die teils als Grundlage für Schulanachten, teils für „stille

Augenblicke" Handreichung tun sollen. Neben manchem Unpassenden finden sich viele sinnreiche und anregende Aussprüche auch aus dem Munde solcher, die dem Christentum ferngestanden, aber dennoch treffliche Wahrheiten in schöner Form zum Ausdruck gebracht haben. Wer kennt nicht den Wert der Aussprüche großer Dichter und Denker? Welch tiefe Wahrheit liegt z. B. in den Worten eines Goethe auf Seite 124: „Hammer zu sein scheint jedem rühmlicher und wünschenswerter als Amboss; und doch, was gehört nicht dazu, diese unendlichen, immer wiederkehrenden Schläge auszuhalten!“ Wir fügen hinzu: In dem Herrn, und in ihm allein, haben wir dazu Kraft und Stärke. Die einzelnen Blätter des Buches geben genügend Gelegenheit, die Sammlung durch manche Aussprüche, die einem persönlich zusagen, zu vermehren.

L. h. S ä t s c h.

Screen and Projector in Christian Education. By *Paul H. Janes*. Philadelphia. The Westminster Press. 1932. 160 pages, 5×7½. Price, \$1.00.

The scope of this book is more exactly shown by its subtitle: *How to Use Motion Pictures and Projected Still Pictures in Worship, Study, and Recreation*. The author rightly says: "With the addition of motion-pictures, projected still pictures, prints, photographs, models, maps, school journeys, and reproduced sound, the educator has set out to stimulate a wealth of experiences to be used in the classroom to facilitate the understanding of the verbal symbols in books." (P. 14.) We should like to emphasize the words "in the classroom" and add "in the church hall," because visual education has proved an invaluable aid in the work of our parish-schools, Sunday-schools, young people's societies, and the various auxiliary organizations of the congregation. Every pastor who desires to have accurate information concerning the use of visual education helps will be glad to use the information contained in this book. We cannot endorse the larger part of Chapter V, on "The Use of Visual Aids in Worship," because the doctrinal and expository sermons of the Lutheran Church will rarely require, in most cases not even permit, the use of pictures. There are other dangers connected with the indiscriminate use of visual aids, especially if the emotional element is stressed. To such as will make use of the proper discrimination this book offers fine suggestions.

P. E. KRETZMANN.

Concordia Historical Institute Quarterly. Subscription, 50 cts. per copy, \$2.00 a year. Vol. 5, October, 1932. Send applications for subscription or membership to Mr. Theo. W. Eckhart, 3558 South Jefferson Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.

This issue contains the reports of the second triennial convention of Concordia Historical Institute, held in Milwaukee, June 18, 1932. The Rev. K. Kretzmann offers instructing notes on "Methods of Historical Research Work." Mr. E. H. A. Arndt writes in an interesting manner on "The Beginnings of Our Work in China," the first instalment of a series of articles on this important phase of our mission-work. "A Brief History of Lutheran Education in Oregon," by Martin P. Simon, and "Documents Regarding Church Affiliation and Organic Union in the Lutheran Church of America," by Prof. P. Kretzmann, fill the remaining pages. The purpose of this society merits our support even in these times of depression.

T. L.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

The Macmillan Company, New York: —

How to Use Your Church. By *Louis Jabine*. 96 pages. Price, \$1.00.

Fleming H. Revell Company, New York, London, and Edinburgh: —

Animated Junior Sermons. By *W. Clarence Wright, M. A.* Illustrated by *Jean Vaughan*. 156 pages, 5×7½. Price, \$1.50.

The Christ I Know. An Intimate Study of the Master. By *Thomas Jefferson Villers, D. D., LL. D.* 189 pages, 5×7½. Price, \$1.50.

The Oriental Missionary Society, Los Angeles, Cal.: —

Streams in the Desert. Compiled by *Mrs. Chas. E. Cowman*. 378 pages, 5½×7½. Price, \$1.50.

Consolation. Compiled by *Mrs. Chas. E. Cowman*. 367 pages, 5½×7½. Price, \$1.50.

Die evangelische Theologie. Ihr jetziger Stand und ihre Aufgaben. 3. Teil: Die Kirchengeschichte. 1. Hälfte. Von *Gustav Krüger*. Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, Halle a. d. S. 77 Seiten 5¼×9. Preis: M. 3. 2. Hälfte, 1. Abteilung: 4. Reformation und Gegenreformation. Von *D. Dr. Gustav Krüger*. 50 Seiten. Preis: M. 2.50. 4. Teil: Die systematische Theologie. Von *D. Horst Stephan*. 93 Seiten. Preis: M. 3.60. 5. Teil: Die praktische Theologie. Von *D. Eduard Freiherrn von der Goltz*. 70 Seiten. Preis: M. 1.80.

Christliche Wehrkraft. Die Jungschärbewegung. Dargeboten von Rektor *Wilhelm Leh.* Vierzehnter Band. Verlag von Paul Müller, München. 95 Seiten 5×7, in starkem Umschlag. Preis: M. 1.50.

Ungläubige Jugend. Von *R. Verche*. Sechzehnter Band. 90 Seiten.

Der Anmarsch der „Gottlosen“. Gegenwartsaufgaben des Volkslehrers. Von Rektor *Wilhelm Leh.* Siebzehnter Band. 68 Seiten.

Das junge Mädchen unter der Gewalt des öffentlichen Lebens. Von *Hans Pförtner*. Achtzehnter Band. 86 Seiten.

Jugendseelsorge. Von *D. theol. Hans Eder*, Pfarrer und Senior. Neunzehnter Band. 89 Seiten.

Ansätze des Glaubens im Alten Testament. Von Kirchenrat *Lembert*. Zwanzigster Band. 99 Seiten. Preis: M. 1.35.

Bege zum Nächsten. Von *Hans Pförtner*. Einundzwanzigster Band. 86 Seiten.

Zwischen Hammer und Amboss. Religiöse Gedanken und Aphorismen. Von *W. J. Schler*. 82 Seiten.

NOTICE TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

In order to render satisfactory service, we must have our current mailing-list correct. The expense of maintaining this list has been materially increased. Under present regulations we are subject to a "fine" on all parcels mailed to an incorrect address, inasmuch as we must pay 2 cents for every notification sent by the postmaster on a parcel or periodical which is undeliverable because no forwarding address is available or because there has been a change of address. This may seem insignificant, but in view of the fact that we have subscribers getting three or more of our periodicals and considering our large aggregate subscription list, it may readily be seen that it amounts to quite a sum during a year; for the postmaster will address a notification to each individual periodical. Our subscribers can help us by notifying us—one notification (postal card, costing only 1 cent) will take care of the addresses for several publications. We shall be very grateful for your cooperation.

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, St. Louis, Mo.

Kindly consult the address label on this paper to ascertain whether your subscription has expired or will soon expire. "Jan 33" on the label means that your subscription has expired. Please pay your agent or the Publisher promptly in order to avoid interruption of service. It takes about two weeks before the address label can show change of address or acknowledgment of remittance.

When paying your subscription, please mention name of publication desired and exact name and address (both old and new, if change of address is requested).

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, St. Louis, Mo.